

GRILLPARZER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JEWS

BY

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DE-
GREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

NEW YORK · 1936

832.7
G859Yc

UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARY



GRILLPARZER'S ATTITUDE
TOWARD THE JEWS

GRILLPARZER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JEWS

BY

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DE-
GREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

NEW YORK · 1936

Copyright 1936

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT



GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY, MENASHA, WISCONSIN

To

C. D. S. *and* R. L. S.

93156

PREFACE

In evaluating an outstanding personality's attitude toward the Jews at a time when the Jewish problem has become more acute than ever, one runs the risk of allowing contemporary events or personal convictions to influence one's interpretation of the facts. The author has been ever mindful of this danger and has treated the problem of ascertaining Grillparzer's relationship to the Jews from an objective and literary point of view. Although many facts mentioned here are well known, they are set forth because of their direct bearing on the subject.

How Grillparzer felt about the Jews is important only in so far as it gives the world an insight into his personality and *Weltanschauung*, and in so far as it enables us to give a more correct interpretation to his drama *Die Jüdin von Toledo* and his dramatic fragment *Esther*. It will be the scope of this dissertation to evaluate the external and internal factors which helped shape Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews with a view to determining his place in the history of thought. If Grillparzer's views about the Jews are in harmony with the humanistic attitude of the great classicists, Lessing, Schiller and Goethe, they are, *ipso facto*, an additional refutation of the school which regards Grillparzer as baroque rather than humanistic.

It is with the deepest gratitude that I acknowledge the helpful co-operation of Professors Brennecke and Nordmeyer whose advice and suggestions were of immeasurable value in the interpretation of the material gathered by me. They gave generously of their time to careful and critical reading of this dissertation and were at all times most patient and encouraging. Professor Nordmeyer was kind enough to help in the arduous task of proof-reading. I am also grateful to Professors Zinnecker, Steitz, Schuchard, and Sommerfeld for the care with which they read the manuscript.

To Columbia University Library I owe a debt of gratitude for the many courtesies which I enjoyed there.

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

Brooklyn College,
June 1, 1936.

ABBREVIATIONS

- W.—Grillparzer, Franz, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by August Sauer and continued by Reinhold Backmann, Historisch-Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Wien, 1909ff.
Section I, vols. 7, 10, 14, 16.
Section II, vols. 7-12.
Section III, vols. 1-3.
- W. 1893 ed.—Grillparzer, Franz, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by August Sauer, Stuttgart, 1893.
vol. III.
- Jhb.—*Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, Wien, 1891ff.
vols. 1-33.
- Gesp.—*Grillparzer: Gespräche und Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit*, ed. by August Sauer, Wien, 1905, *Schriften des Lit. Vereins in Wien*, I, III, VI, XII, XV, XX.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	viii
Introduction	xi
Chapter I—Grillparzer's <i>Weltanschauung</i>	I
Home environment; attitude toward religion; influence of Lessing, Schiller and Goethe; analysis of personality.	
Chapter II—History of the Jews in Vienna	10
First settlement in Austria; laws and regulations governing their existence; liberalism of Joseph II; Revolution of 1848; citizenship and equality; laws of 1868.	
Chapter III—Grillparzer's Contacts with the Jews	16
Social contacts; Ludlam, Concordia, Jewish Salons;	
Literary contacts; Wertheimer, Frankl, Paoli, Weilen, Liebens, Mosenthal, Joel, Jeitteles (Aloys), Heller, Jeitteles (Itzig), Kuh, Mandl, Saphir, Witthauer, Engländer.	
Travel contacts; Rahel Varnhagen, Börne, Heine, Meyerbeer; Neuwalls, Rothschilds, Figdors, Sztankovits.	
Miscellaneous contacts; Dessauer, Bacher, Levi, Löwenthal, Bornstein, Semler.	
Chapter IV—Grillparzer's Direct Expression of Opinion about Jews	68
References to Jews in diaries; autobiography.	
Chapter V—Grillparzer's Indirect Expression of Opinion about Jews	72
<i>Die Jüdin von Toledo</i> —Genesis; literary influences; personal influences; treatment of characters.	
<i>Esther</i> —Genesis; literary influences; reports of Zimmermann, Frankl, Littrow-Bischoff; treatment of characters.	
Poems and epigrams.	
Chapter VI—Conclusion	115
Bibliography	123

INTRODUCTION

Of the great writers, Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Hebbel, and Grillparzer, Grillparzer is the only one whose attitude toward the Jews has not been ascertained.¹ Yet his contacts with Jews were much more numerous than those of the others mentioned above. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that Grillparzer had, with the possible exception of Hebbel, more opportunity to meet and associate with Jews. It was during his lifetime that their lot improved greatly. The liberal laws of Joseph II transformed the ghetto resident, whose very dress was determined by decree, into a self-respecting person. The subsequent laws of 1848 and 1868 brought about the complete emancipation of the Jews and granted them the same rights and privileges as those enjoyed by Christians. In Vienna particularly, the Jews had attained in a relatively short time a prominent place in the fields of art and journalism. In his intellectual and social milieu Grillparzer had ample opportunity during his long life to meet many Jews. Some of them he came to know intimately, and others, but superficially. Some were destined to play a vital part in his life and career, others were but specks on the vast canvas of his existence.

As the young author of *Die Ahnfrau* and *Sappho*, he was lionized by the hostesses of the great salons of Vienna. Chief among these were the three Jewish salons of the Eskeles, Wertheimer, and Arnstein-Pereira families, where Grillparzer was a frequent guest. In the course of his numerous travels, he met Rahel Varnhagen in Berlin, Heine, Börne, Meyerbeer, the Rothschild and Neuwall families in Paris, the Figdor family in London, and the Sztankovits family in Pest. He associated also with the composer Dessauer, with the writers and critics Frankl, Kuh, Lorm, Mosenthal, Paoli, Jeitteles, Saphir, Kuranda, Engländer, and Witthauer. With the Lieben family of Vienna he maintained a friendship over a long period of years.

¹The outstanding books are Adolf Bartels' *Hebbel und die Juden* and *Lessing und die Juden*, Ludwig Geiger's *Die deutsche Literatur und die Juden* in which he treats the relationship of Herder, Schiller and Goethe to the Jews, and Mark Waldman's *Goethe and the Jews*.

What Grillparzer thought of these people in particular and of the Jews in general, can best be gleaned from his own writings. These consist of direct references to the Jews in his diaries, letters, autobiography and *Gespräche*, and of indirect and artistic expressions in *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, *Esther*, and many poems and epigrams. It is rather surprising that in spite of the wealth of material supplied by Grillparzer himself, not one of his many commentators and biographers has availed himself of it in an attempt to find out just what Grillparzer's views were regarding the Jews. There is rarely ever anything beyond a brief comment to the effect that he was or was not anti-Semitic. How valid either of these assumptions is, will be determined in this dissertation.

GRILLPARZER'S *WELTANSCHAUUNG*

Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews takes on a new significance if examined in the light of his *Weltanschauung*. This is conditioned by his background, his environment, his physical and mental make-up, and by his experiences throughout his life. A certain dualism is discernible in Grillparzer's *Weltanschauung*, as well as in his general orientation toward life, which undoubtedly has its roots in his parentage.¹ From his father Grillparzer inherited his liberalism and his ability to view everything in the light of reason. From his mother he inherited an emotional and nervous instability, a love and appreciation of music and a morbid outlook on life. These dissimilar traits were constantly at war within him and were responsible for a great deal of his unhappiness.

In reading Grillparzer's autobiography and diaries, one finds numerous passages relating to his religious experiences which are contradictory. This is due to the fact that he oscillated between the devoutly religious Catholicism of his mother who went to church every Sunday, and the rationalistic scepticism of his father who frequently expressed opinions bordering on atheism. On the whole, it was the father's influence which made itself felt early in the boy's life, in spite of the fact that for a short time Grillparzer nursed a secret ambition to become a priest.

Grillparzer was born at a time when liberalism was in the ascendant. Ten years before his birth Lessing had preached his final sermon on religious tolerance in his *Nathan der Weise*. About the same time Joseph II, a great admirer of Voltaire, ascended the throne of Austria, and with his Edict of Toleration in 1781 marked the beginning of religious freedom for all. The decade of his reign was the most liberal in Austria and the term Josephinism was applied to all that stood for tolerance, humanity and liberal-

¹ Richard Mahrenholtz, *Franz Grillparzer, sein Leben und Schaffen*, p. 81: "Die Disharmonie, welche seine Weltanschauung, Lebens- und Kunstansicht nicht verleugnen können, mag in letzter Linie auf die Mischung des schweren bajuvarischen und des leichteren österreichischen Blutes zurückgehen, sie war ein Familienerbteil . . .".

ism. Grillparzer's father, and he, too, were strongly influenced by the Josephinistic philosophy of life.

In Grillparzer's autobiography we read that he never went to church as a young boy and that he was frequently embarrassed in his *Gymnasium* days because he did not know when to kneel or when to beat his breast at the daily mass. It was necessary for him to glance surreptitiously at his neighbor and to emulate his actions.² In his diary, on the other hand, we read that there was a short time during his pre-*Gymnasium* days in which he attended church diligently because he had made up his mind to become a priest. He did not waver in this determination even though he experienced nothing but boredom while in church. In fact, he tried to punish himself for his lack of religious devotion by staying in church for hours, he writes.³ It was not long, however, before he entered the *Gymnasium* and other desires and ambitions replaced his wish to read mass from a pulpit.

Although Grillparzer states in his autobiography that his childhood was not in the least religious,⁴ we read in his diary: "Man kann sich nichts Sonderbareres denken als den Gang, den meine Ideen über Gott und Religion von meiner frühesten Kindheit bis in mein reiferes Alter nahmen. Von Aeltern entsprossen, die, wenn sie auch eben nicht streng religiös dachten, doch wenigstens der Welt und ihrer Kinder willen religiös handelten, unter Personen erzogen die mit ängstlicher Genauigkeit alles erfüllten, was nur immer die geistliche Etiquette ihren Verehrern vorschreiben kann, war es nicht anders möglich, als dass eine innige Ehrfurcht vor Gott und seinen Stellvertretern auf Erden in meiner jungen Seele Wurzel fasste."⁵ It was at this time that the glory and splendor of the church ritual made such a strong impression upon his active imagination that he made an altar out of pasteboard and read mass from it. His younger brother usually assisted the embryo priest as sexton. The sermons which young Franz preached were so eloquent that his sole listener, the servant girl, was moved to tears.⁶

² W. I, 16, p. 71.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 16, p. 71.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 7, p. 27.

⁵ W. II, 7, p. 25.

Grillparzer's reading consisted at that time of adventure novels and the Bible. He was most fascinated by the legends of the Saints, centering all his attention on the accounts of torture and martyrdom. His ambition then was to become a monk and to accomplish great deeds of heroism. It is interesting to note that he was not attracted by the New Testament but by the Jewish warriors, Gideon and the Maccabees.

That Grillparzer turned more and more away from the church and from formal religion in his later years, is agreed upon by most of his biographers. Yet, Weilen, who saw a great deal of the aged Grillparzer, quotes him as saying on January 1, 1871: "Ich fange an religiös zu werden, der Glaube wie der Unglaube sind beweislos, bleiben wir bei ersterem, er tut uns wohl."⁷ There seems, however, to be no uniform conception regarding his attitude toward religion as a whole. Alker feels that Grillparzer's inherently religious nature was stifled by his home environment.⁸ He undoubtedly refers to the scepticism of the father and to the indifference of both parents regarding the religious training of the children. Roselieb maintains that Grillparzer's early belief in the dogmas of the Church was superseded by the conviction that the only approach to truth was through personal experience.⁹ Jerusalem, on the other hand, claims that Grillparzer's religion is based essentially on feeling, and that the poet never believed in the truth of Church dogma.¹⁰

On one point there is agreement, namely, that he was not a believer in the real sense of the word. Grillparzer valued Christianity as an historical phenomenon, but he was definitely a sceptic so far as formal religion was concerned. Löwenthal quotes Grillparzer as saying to him in the course of one of their conversations: "Das Christentum kann doch, wenigstens modifiziert, in lange Zeiten fort dauern, wenn man nicht daran rührt."¹¹ He did not think that the Church could act as a control on unworthy individuals, but rather that the ethical worth of a person lent value to his beliefs. He was frequently curious to see the effect of church ritual on the truly devout. Prompted by this curiosity he visited

⁷ *Gesp.*, XX, p. 3.

⁸ *Franz Grillparzer, ein Kampf um Leben und Kunst*, p. 185.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹⁰ *Gedanken und Dichter*, p. 64.

¹¹ *Gesp.*, XX, p. 200.

a church in Naples, during his stay in Italy in 1819, for the sole purpose of witnessing the miracle of the liquefaction of Christ's blood. He watched the proceedings as an incredulous sceptic whose rationalistic attitude precluded the possibility of his feeling the awe of the other witnesses.¹²

This same curiosity caused him to visit the Pope. In order to see him in close proximity, he stood in a gallery through which the Pope had to pass. When he did appear and all the others present bent down to kiss his foot, Grillparzer had to follow their example. "Hätte ich die hündische Art gekannt, wie der Fusskuss geschieht, ich wäre weggeblieben. Man muss sich dazu, da der Alte den Fuss nicht heben kann, fast auf den Bauch niederlegen. In's Himmelsnamen! Man tut wohl viel ärgere Dinge."¹³ This was his reaction to the homage paid to the head of the Catholic Church.

It is a difficult task to reduce a man of Grillparzer's complexity and inconsistency to his elementary structure. Just as it is difficult to reconcile the somewhat religious passages of the autobiography with the definitely irreligious ones of his diaries, so it is difficult to accept his many contradictory traits and utterances and unite them into anything resembling a consistent philosophy. It is for that reason that there is a great deal of critical difference of opinion concerning the correct interpretation of Grillparzer's views. Only if one bears in mind the dualism of his nature, this lack of harmony within him, which made him say that two beings inhabited his body, a poet of great imagination and a man of cold reason, can one accept his various utterances as different manifestations of the struggle between "Sammlung und Zerstreuung."

As Grillparzer advanced in years, he withdrew more and more from the world about him. He became indifferent to the joys and sorrows of his existence. Roselieb believes that Grillparzer subconsciously became a quietist and thus sought escape from the trials of life in a philosophy which preaches aloofness and indifference.¹⁴ Admiring strength and power, he felt himself destined to a life of weakness and indecision. In his bitterness, he believed

¹² W. II, 7, p. 187.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

that the stupid bureaucracy and censorship of his day had dried up the founts of his genius.

His quietistic outlook on life made his disappointments appear inconsequential, so that whenever one of his works was misunderstood, he merely withdrew further into his shell. Unfortunately, he was not always under the spell of his quietism. Thus there were times when he wanted encouragement, understanding, friendship, and also success. As a quietist he regarded his body as an unimportant vessel for his soul, and felt that one's physical existence was nothing as compared with one's spiritual life. Yet he complained about his health constantly and was given to hypochondria to no small degree. He shunned people, yet felt unhappy and deserted when alone. He wanted to travel, but no sooner did he set out, than he wanted to turn back. His entire life was a search for peace and calm which he never found. Even his belated recognition failed to bring him the slightest happiness. It came too late.

Although Grillparzer's *Weltanschauung* as a whole is conditioned by the inconsistencies and lack of harmony in his own soul, he was in many respects a disciple of the great triumvirate of German literature, Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe. It was largely due to his contact with Josef Schreyvogel that Grillparzer's interest in the classics was stimulated. Before he came in direct contact with Schreyvogel, Grillparzer had read the works of Schiller and made minor attempts to imitate him. The most successful of these was his *Blanka von Kastilien*. Through his reading of the *Sonntagsblätter* which Schreyvogel edited, Grillparzer began to worship at Goethe's shrine. In *Sappho* Goethe's influence is most apparent.

Schreyvogel, who had associated with Goethe and Schiller in Jena, before he returned to Vienna in 1796, was also a great admirer of Lessing. In his diary we read that Lessing's *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* is a sensible interpretation of Revelation. In connection with this, Schreyvogel wrote: "Auch das Judenthum erscheint in dieser Ansicht in einem milderem Lichte; es passt gut in den grossen Erziehungsplan Gottes. Und vollends das Christenthum: Wie sehr verdienen beide Religionen gekannt

zu werden!"¹⁵ He had also read Lessing's *Nathan der Weise* whose humane tolerance he shared. On Schreyvogel's epitaph Grillparzer wrote: "Stand jemand Lessing nahe so war er's."¹⁶

It was through Schreyvogel, then, that Grillparzer came definitely under the spell of the classicists, and it was also through him that Grillparzer came to write his first important drama, *Die Ahnfrau*. It is interesting to note that Grillparzer did not start to write this piece, claiming that he lacked the proper inspiration, until he was urged on by Schreyvogel with the statement that even a genius like Goethe had to force himself at times to write. It was through a study of Goethe that Grillparzer began to be concerned more with the world about him, and less with his own problems and shortcomings. Like Goethe, he went to Italy in search of peace and inspiration at the bosom of classical antiquity. But unlike Goethe, he was disappointed, because he expected too much, and because he lacked the inner harmony which was part of Goethe. Here, as in everything else in his life, his idealism was shattered on the rocks of reality.

His love of the "edle Einfalt und stille Grösse" of classical antiquity had a very important effect upon his destiny. While in Rome he wrote a poem, *Die Ruinen des campo vaccino in Rom*, in which he mourned the destruction of the erstwhile scene of pagan glory. Although he merely gave poetic vent to his grief at the sight of the ancient ruins which had to bear the Christian cross, the symbol of the conqueror, the reactionary Austrian government saw in the poem a deliberate insult to Christianity. From that time on Grillparzer was *persona non grata* at the court. The added fact that he was an adherent of Josephinism, and that he associated with known liberals, was sufficient to cause him innumerable difficulties with the Vienna police. Not only were his works subjected to the closest scrutiny, but his house was even raided on one occasion. We can only speculate as to what might have been the effect on Grillparzer's career had he not incurred the disfavor and suspicion of the government. He certainly would not have had to spend the greater part of his life as a minor official, nor would he have met with so much antagonism toward his works.

¹⁵ *Tagebücher*, I, p. 225, entry of December 27, 1812.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, LXXVII.

Regarding Grillparzer's adherence to the liberal philosophy of Joseph II, we read in Frankl's biography of Grillparzer that he was a "Josefiner." "Das ist ein Mann, wie deren es in der vormärzlichen Zeit Viele gab, der in der freiheitlichen Stimmung, die Kaiser Josef II hervorrief, aufgewachsen, an ihr um so fester hing, als dieselbe in einer spätern Zeit, namentlich auf religiösem Gebiete, verdunkelt, wohl auch vernichtet worden ist," Frankl explains.¹⁷ It was enough to be suspected of Josephinism, to be watched and spied upon, he adds. Even when Grillparzer was in Paris in 1836 he felt the eyes of the Austrian Consul upon him, so that he had to be particularly careful about not being seen with refugees. In spite of this fact, Grillparzer's liberalism increased with the years. When his growing prominence brought him belated recognition, and he was elected to a life membership in the Austrian House of Lords, he took great pains to be present at the voting on the liberal laws of 1868.

In connection with this Frankl relates that Grillparzer had not visited the House of Lords for years, because of old age and deafness. Yet on the day that they were going to vote on the laws granting religious freedom to all, Grillparzer attended the meeting, even though he had to be carried up the stairs. The liberals greeted his appearance with exclamations of joy. "Als die Erzherzogin Sophie davon hörte, äusserte sie: 'Der alte Mann hätte auch gut zu Hause bleiben können und bedenken sollen, dass er bald Gott Rechenschaft abzulegen haben wird,' " writes Frankl.¹⁸

What were the provisions of these laws which brought the seventy-seven year old Grillparzer to the House of Lords after an absence of years? The Liberal party forced through a series of laws which curtailed the time-honored prerogatives of the Catholic Church. Every individual was assured freedom of religion and worship. All government positions were open to everyone, regard-

¹⁷ *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzers*, p. 56. Cf. also R. Backmann, "Grillparzer als Revolutionär". *Euphoriön*, 1931, Vol. 32, p. 176; also Max Koch, *Franz Grillparzer, eine Charakteristik*, p. 7. Regarding his liberalism. Löwenthal quotes Grillparzer as saying to him: "Ich bin sicher ein harmloser Liberaler; ich bin es nicht für Oesterreich, und das kann man auch nicht sein, sondern nur für die ganze übrige Welt, damit, wenn das Liberale dort überall feststeht, doch auch unser Vaterland endlich notgedrungen nachtapfen müsse." *Gesp.*, XX, p. 199.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

less of creed. The State took over the control of the schools, until then in the hands of the Church. Civil marriages became legal. In spite of the protests of the Pope, who declared these laws null and void, they were retained.

Grillparzer's love of antiquity and his liberalism link him definitely with the humanists of Weimar. Like them, he placed humanity above narrow nationalism. He felt that the stressing of racial questions was a step backward. In the two epigrams quoted below and written in 1849 when the Hungarians and Czechs agitated for separation from the empire, we see his attitude toward nationalism:

„Ein Vorzug bleibt uns ewig unverloren
Man nennt ihn heut Nationalität,
Sie sagt, dass irgendwo der Mensch geboren,
Was sich nun freilich von selbst versteht.“¹⁹

and

„Der Weg der neuern Bildung geht,
Von Humanität,
Durch Nationalität
Zur Bestialität.“²⁰

Concerning nationalism he also said: "Ich kenne nur zwei Nationalitäten, die G'scheidten und die Dummen."²¹

Like Goethe, he was a student of Spinoza with whom he agreed on the non-existence of free will.²² He felt himself closely drawn to classical antiquity because of its belief in fate. It is, therefore, not by accident that he wrote *Die Ahnfrau* even though he resented the fact that it was grouped with the fate tragedies of Werner and Müllner. With Goethe, too, he shared his aversion to the Romantic school.

In his attitude toward religion, and in his attempts to examine Revelation in the light of reason, he is definitely influenced by Lessing. He admired his *Nathan der Weise* so much that he wished he might have written it.²³ Like Lessing, he was above bigotry and intolerance of any kind. While under the tutelage of Schreyvogel, he had ample opportunity to absorb the liberal spirit of Lessing.

¹⁹ Otto Zausmer, "Beiträge zur politischen Lyrik Grillparzers," *Jhb.*, 32, p. 77.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Gesp.*, XV, p. 237.

²² *W.*, II, 8, pp. 3ff.

²³ Adolf Foglar, *Grillparzers Ansichten über Lit., Bühne und Leben*, p. 34.

Grillparzer was a great humanitarian who felt that it was the duty of every one to serve mankind and to put its interests above everything else. In this, too, he resembles the classicists. In his aversion to mob rule and sudden upheaval he is in harmony with the classical ideal. During the Revolution of 1848 he incurred the criticism of the liberals because he wrote a poem to Radetzky. They called him reactionary and servile. In answer to their attack he wrote the following epigram:

„Als liberal einst der Verfolgung Ziel,
Schilt mich der Freiheitstaumel nun servil.
Nicht hier noch dort in den Extremen zünftig,
Ich glaube bald, ich bin vernünftig.“²⁴

Bearing in mind the fact that Grillparzer's early home environment was not of a particularly religious nature, that he inherited his father's liberal and philosophical view of religion, that he was an objective student of religion, making many comments in his diaries on all the stages in man's worship of God, that he was under the liberal and humanistic influence of Lessing and Weimar, we are ready to examine his attitude toward the Jews.²⁵ Will this attitude be in harmony with his *Weltanschauung*? Will it be consistent throughout or will it show the dualism which is part of his being?²⁶ To what extent does his attitude toward the Jews affect his treatment of the Jewish characters in *Die Jüdin von Toledo* and *Esther*? And above all, will this attitude toward the Jews justify his classification as a humanist and classicist?

²⁴ Zausmer, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

²⁵ Since a thorough study of his comments on religion lies outside the scope of this dissertation, except in so far as it tends to shed any light on his attitude toward the Jews, the following comment will serve as an example of most of them: "Das Christentum ist die Religion der Melancholischen und Hypochondristen. Wenn dagegen Islam das Phlegma begünstigt, und der Judaismus seinen Anhängern eine gewisse cholerische Heftigkeit mittheilt, so kann man den griechischen Heiden wohl recht gut den glücklichen Sanguiniker nennen." W. II, 7, p. 236.

²⁶ It is interesting to note that in his book, *Goethe and the Jews*, Waldman sees a dualism in Goethe's attitude. He was very much interested in the lot of the Jews, but was conditioned to prejudice by his early training, Waldman claims, p. xiv.

CHAPTER II HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN VIENNA

During the period of Grillparzer's life, the condition of the Jews in Vienna was subject to greater change than at any other time in the history of Europe. The liberalizing influence of Joseph II was making itself felt, and the Jews were emerging from behind the money counters to take their place in the intellectual and artistic life of the times. They rushed into fields previously prohibited to them, and in a comparatively short time attained a prominence in the intellectual and professional fields far out of proportion to their actual numbers. This change in the lot of the Jews was so great that a man of Grillparzer's type must have been definitely aware of it, particularly in view of his contacts with them while these changes were coming about. By his support of the liberal laws of 1868 Grillparzer helped to ameliorate the conditions under which the Jews lived.

To understand the full meaning of Grillparzer's contacts with the Jews, it is necessary to glance at the history of the Jewish people from the moment of their first settlement in Austria to the end of Grillparzer's life. It is only after obtaining a clear picture of the background from which the Jews emerged, a background which they remembered very clearly, that we can gain the proper perspective of Grillparzer's relationship to them.¹

The date of the first settlement of the Jews in Austria is unknown. The documentary evidence in existence establishes their presence in Austria in the ninth century. In the twelfth century Duke Leopold VI (1177-94) had a Jewish master of the mint, named Schlom, who was killed by crusaders. In 1238 the first charter to offer some protection to the Jews, and, at the same time, to limit their occupations, was granted them by Frederick II. Subsequent charters of later rulers defined the position of the Jews in the community. They had to undergo many persecutions and were blamed for any and all misfortunes which befell the land,

¹ For further details on the history of the Jews and for bibliography cf. Gerson Wolf, *Geschichte der Juden in Wien* and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, pp. 321ff.

including the Black Death. At that time entire communities of Jews were massacred.

The earliest regulations of their occupations limited them to money-lending. Various dukes threatened them with expulsion if they refused to make loans on demand. In the fifteenth century, during the reign of Albrecht V (1404-39), a religious fanatic, Jews refusing to accept Christianity were imprisoned or burned at the stake. He also expelled all the Jews from Vienna in 1421. Even though Pope Paul II issued a bull on March 31, 1469 declaring that the Jews had a right to be treated justly, it did not change matters much. When Maximilian (1493-1519) waged war on Francis I of France, the Jews lent him money. As a reward for this he granted permission to one of them to reside in Vienna. They were still constantly ostracized by the populace and the clergy, which refused to admit to communion or grant absolution to judges rendering sentence in favor of a Jew.

The first to show any consideration for them was Charles V (1519-56), who declared himself against expulsion of Jews from places where they had once lived. He did not share the common belief that they used Christian blood for ritual purposes. During the reign of Ferdinand II (1619-37) the Jews were treated with comparative fairness. They again began to settle in Vienna, after the charter of December 6, 1624 assured them undisturbed residence. They were, of course, segregated in ghettos and were considered merely as suppliers of money to the royal exchequer. Whenever an Emperor's debt to the Jews became too high, he lowered it and in return granted them some new rights.

For almost fifty years the Jews lived in the suburbs of Vienna. But in 1670 they were again expelled. The wife of Leopold I (1657-1705) had had a miscarriage which was blamed on the Jews, because, upon hearing that a royal heir was expected, they had presented the Empress with a golden cradle. As a result, 3000 families were expelled from Vienna, and about 477 families from lower Austria. Their synagogue was turned into a church, their houses were sold to Christians at ridiculously low prices, and the Jews were again in search of a new home.

With the expulsion of the Jews from Vienna, the anticipated

Utopia of the populace did not materialize. The joy of the Christians was shortlived, when they began to feel the burden of the high taxes formerly paid by the Jews. It was not long before an increase in the cost of living caused the people to doubt the wisdom of the expulsion. On September 26, 1673 a conference was called in Wischau, Moravia, the purpose of which was to bring the Jews back to Vienna. The Jews, anxious to come back in spite of the injustice of their expulsion, offered among other things, to pay 300,000 florins for the privilege of residing in Vienna's ghetto. This was granted and about 250 families returned, only to find that they had lost whatever rights they had had before the exodus.

During the siege of Vienna by the Turks, two Jews distinguished themselves by furnishing money and provisions to the government. These two, Oppenheimer and Wertheimber, were given certain honors and were granted permission to buy houses in any part of the city. Among the restrictions imposed upon them, were the following: Every week they were required to submit to the court lists of Jewish servants in their households and their intended length of stay. They were not allowed to shelter Jews not connected with their own households, nor were they allowed any freedom of worship except in their own homes. One of Wertheimber's descendants was a friend of Grillparzer, as we shall later see.

In addition to the regular taxes, special levies were imposed upon the Jews arbitrarily. For example, Charles VI demanded of the Vienna Jews 148,000 florins in 1711 to defray the expenses of his coronation. Maria Theresa, the mother of the liberal Joseph II, was particularly hostile to the Jews and imposed additional hardships upon them. They had to pay a tribute of 3,000,000 florins in order not to be expelled from Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. Lest the Jews escape the stigma of their race, they were forced to wear yellow bands on their left arms. Whenever a theft was committed the Jews were held responsible and had to replace the loss. In 1756 they complained against this injustice. "Es wurde hierauf beschlossen, dass sie nur dann in solidum zu haften haben, wenn entweder der Dieb oder derjenige, der das gestohlene Gut kaufte, ein Wiener Jude war," we read in Wolf's history of the

Vienna Jews.² They were prohibited from having any intercourse with Christians. They were permitted, however, to use Christian doctors and druggists, but no nurses.

Yet in spite of the many restrictions and the prevailing intolerance, some Jews and Christians established friendly contacts, so that in 1778 Cardinal Magazzi felt himself called upon to complain to the Empress that the Jews had become too intimate with the Christians. They visited the same theatres and inns, dressed like Christians and employed Christians as servants, he charged. This complaint was ignored by the Empress. On February 14, 1780, contrary to her usual attitude, she issued the following dictum: "Die Juden sind von der Anstellung für Staatsämter nicht auszuschliessen, sondern nur so wenig als möglich anzustellen."³

With the ascension of Joseph II to the Austrian throne a new and liberal era began for the Austrian Jews. He considered it his duty to improve their condition. He abrogated the law which required them to wear special dress as a mark of their race. He granted them permission to establish schools or to send their children to the public schools. He urged them to assimilate, to use the language of the country, and to enter institutions of higher learning. He also instituted military service for them. They could now build factories, enter various trades, apprentice themselves to Christian artisans, and keep Christian help. They could take on family names, were allowed to mingle freely with Christians, and no longer had to stay in their houses on Sundays and holidays until 12 o'clock, as heretofore. Although Joseph II was against any distinctions as to race or creed, he did not grant them the rights and privileges of citizenship.

After the death of Joseph II the Jews again became subject to numerous regulations restricting their freedom. Only "Tolerirte" Jews could live in Vienna. The others had to be in the service of the tolerated or become tolerated in their own right. To obtain this privilege they had to show possession of 10,000 florins. A tolerated Jew could not transfer his privileges and upon his death

² *Die Geschichte der Juden in Wien*, p. 60.

³ Wolf, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

his widow and children had to leave the city, according to a law of 1807. Various regulations barred the Jews from dealing in furs, raw products, salt, and from becoming druggists.⁴ "Die sogenannten bürgerlichen Gewerbe waren ihnen fast sämmtlich verboten. Die Juden durften nur Handel treiben und, wie wir gesehen haben, war auch dieser beschränkt, und Aerzte werden," writes Wolf.⁵ These were the conditions under which the Jews had to live as Grillparzer was growing into manhood.

In spite of the fact that the government looked with disfavor upon any attempts of the Jews to liberate themselves, and refused passports to Austrian Jews invited by Napoleon to attend the international Jewish Congress in Paris, the Jews continued to assimilate in accordance with the advice of Joseph II. In keeping with this, they decided in 1824 to modernize their manner of worship and to substitute German for the traditional Hebrew. They also petitioned the court for permission to build a new Temple. The Emperor relegated the matter to Count Sedlnitzky, whose spying tactics caused Grillparzer much anxiety, as we shall presently see. The Count passed the task on to one of his subordinates who reported in part: "Würde der neue jüdische Gottesdienst mit zu vielem Pompe gefeiert und bestiegen moderne Philosophen und Pharisäer ihren, den ersten besten Gelehrten so leicht zugänglichen Rednerstuhl, so ist leicht zu befürchten, die jüdischen Bethäuser bekämen in Kürze mehr Zulauf, als unsere christlichen Kirchen, und die Besorgniss, viele Katholiken dadurch wanken zu machen und zum Diskurs zu verleiten, ist wahrlich nicht übertrieben."⁶ On the basis of the above, Sedlnitzky reported to the Emperor that the proposed site was too near a church and that the Jews were becoming too imbued with the liberal spirit of the times. In this, he charged, they were being influenced by philosophical views prevalent in Protestant North Germany.⁷

Although their petition was at first denied, the Jews finally did get permission to build their Temple. As their attempts at assimilation began to bear fruit, the *Hofkanzlei* reported in 1833: "... dass zum Teil durch die Uebertritte einiger Wiener Israeliten eine

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Verbindung zwischen Christen und Juden bewerkstelligt worden sei, und die Juden in Wien aufgehört haben sich wie früher zu isolieren, und die Christen gleichfalls ihre Abneigung gegen die jüdischen Religionsbekenner grösstentheils aufgegeben haben.”⁸ It was not, however, until 1846 that the infamous *Judeneid*, dating back to the fourteenth century, was finally abolished.⁹ This was largely due to the efforts of Josef Wertheimer, about whom we shall read more in connection with Grillparzer’s contacts.

By far the greatest change in the condition of the Jews came with the Revolution of 1848. As a result of it Franz Josef I put the Jews on a basis of equality with the Christians and granted them full political and civic rights in 1849. Except for a short period of reaction, the Jews were no longer barred from any post. They were free to practice any profession. Actually, however, careful discrimination prevented their rise to higher posts in the army or in the government, so that they still had to resort to conversion to obtain a particularly coveted position or rank. The liberal laws of 1868 were the last step in the emancipation of the Jews in Austria.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁹ Gerson Wolf *Die Geschichte der Israelitischen Cultusgemeinde in Wien* (1820-60), gives the text of one of these oaths, p. 82: “Ego P. Judaeus, juro per Deum sanctum, per Deum omnipotentem, qui fecit coelum et terram, mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, quod in hac causa, qua me hic Christianus inculpat innocens sum penitus et immunis. Et si reus sum, terra me absorbeat quae Dathan et Abyron absorbuít. Et si reus sum, paralysis et lepra me invadat, quae praecibus Helisaei, Naaman Syrum dimisit et Jezii puerum Helisaei invasit. Et si reus sum, caducus morbus, flexus sanguinis et gutta repentina me tangat, et mors subitana me rapiat, dispeream, que in corpore et anima ac rebus meis et in sinum Abrahae nunquam perveniam. Et si reus sum, lex Moysi in monte Synai sibi data me deleet et omnis scriptura, quae in quinque libris Moysi scripta est, me confundat. Et si istud juramentum meum non est verum et justum me deleet Adonay et suae Deitatis potentia. Amen.”

GRILLPARZER'S CONTACTS WITH THE JEWS

During the years of Grillparzer's boyhood the Jews were still subject to so many restrictions that it is improbable that he came in any direct contact with them. At any rate, there is no indication of it in any of his records of that period. His parents led a rather secluded life and the children were kept in the dreary house through whose small windows the sun rarely shone. Young Franz spent his early years away from any street adventures and experiences. His friendships did not include any Jews, for the simple reason that the emancipation of the Jews had not yet reached the stage where their children mingled freely with those of Christians.

The first definite contacts which Grillparzer had with any Jews began in 1823. In that year he attended a reception given by the Ludlam club to Karl Maria von Weber.¹ This club had for its members most of Vienna's prominent writers, journalists, artists, musicians, and devotees of the free arts. It was known for its liberal attitude regarding racial and political matters. By that time the restrictions on the Jews were gradually being eased so that fully one quarter of the Ludlam members were Jews.² And it was there, in their company, that Grillparzer spent a great deal of his time.

In March of 1826 Grillparzer became a full-fledged member of Ludlam, and, in compliance with the custom that each member have a nickname, received the name of Saphocles Istrianus, which was a pun on his *Sappho*, and on the place of his birth near the Ister (Danube). He attended their meetings regularly and participated in their merry activities. Although he enjoyed himself there,

¹ *Gesp.*, III, pp. 190f.

² In 1826 the list of members, as given in *Jhb.*, I, p. 346, was as follows (*italized* names are those of known Jews): Karl Schwarz, Ignaz Castelli, *Ignaz Jeitteles*, Wenzel Lambert, Freiherr von Zedlitz, Adalbert Gyrowetz, Fr. Nauwerk, Franz von Stubenrauch, Freiherr von Schlechta, Ladhelberger, Georg Kettel, Ludwig Wallbach, Franz Fidler, *Dr. Felix Joel*, *Samuel und Joseph Biedermann*, *Heinrich Sichrowsky*, Karl Rosenbaum, *Salomon Semler*, Josef Assmayr, *Salomon Czerkowitz*, Angelo Marx, Johann Huber, Ludwig Titze, Alois Fuchs, Franz Hassaurek, Wenzel Würfel, Grillparzer, Jos. Blahatka, Fr. Krug von Nidda, *Jos. Fischhof*, Daffinger, Leopold Haidvogel, Ignaz Steier. Cf. also *Gesp.*, III, pp. 281, 470.

he was not sufficiently free from his inherent morbidity to be really happy. The following entry in his diary is particularly interesting: "ad vocem Scherz treiben: gestern Abends die Ludlam besucht. Was man da Spass macht, wie viel ich da gelacht habe, und immer dabei des marternden Seelenzustandes bewusst. Als ich mich in derlei Zerstreuungen begab, schwebten mir dabei Goethe, Shakespeare, Mozart vor, alles Menschen, die das tiefste künstlerische Sinnen und Schaffen mit dem Erfrischenden einer bewegten, frohen Umgebung zu vereinigen wussten, aber: quod licet Jovi —." ³

The Ludlam group used to meet frequently in the home of Josef Biedermann, a converted Jew, whose family hailed from the ghetto and rose to wealth and power because it revolutionized the wool export trade. Grillparzer was present at these meetings and on one occasion amused the members with a humorous criticism of his *Ottokar*.⁴ Because of the known liberal tendencies of its members the Ludlamshöhle was regarded with suspicion by the police under the leadership of Sedlnitzky. Barely a month after Grillparzer became a member, the police raided the meeting place of the club. After a thorough search of the premises they repaired to the homes of the members. Grillparzer was surprised by the police at 6 o'clock in the morning and was put under house arrest. All his papers were carefully examined.⁵ Although nothing incriminating was found, the mere fact that he was suspected of subversive activities was sufficient to put him into further disfavor with the authorities who had not forgotten *Die Ruinen des campo vaccino*.

Just why Grillparzer, particularly, incurred the displeasure of the police, we can glean from a secret report of 1827 on the activities of Ludlam. "Man erzählt sich Neuigkeiten aus der *Chronique scandaleuse*, satirisiert über Hohe und Niedere, singt schmutzige Lieder, sucht sich in Witzeleien und Zoten zu übertreffen und hält oft wahre Orgien, was auf Stimmung und Gesittung der jüngeren Mitglieder durchaus nur nachteiligen Einfluss geben kann. . . . Wenn sich auch Private oder Juden, wie die Biedermanns etc. über

³ W. II, 8, p. 195.

⁴ *Gesp.* III, p. 282.

⁵ W. II, 8, p. 203.

alles hinaussetzen, so muss man sich doch billig wundern, woher vom Staate besoldete Individuen die Frechheit nehmen, den deutlich ausgesprochenen Wünschen der Regierung geradezu entgegen zu handeln und Auftritte zu erneuern, die bei den sich sogar ins Ausland erstreckenden Verbindungen des Vereins, jeden Teilnehmer nur aufs neue mit vollem Rechte verdächtigen müssen, woher Beamte überhaupt Zeit, Mittel und Kräfte hernehmen dem Staate gehörig zu dienen, wenn der grösste Teil der Nacht in einem wüsten Flottleben vergeudet wird?"⁶ That Grillparzer, who was a government official, had the courage to remain a member of this group in spite of the known antagonism of the authorities toward it, is proof of his courage and liberalism.

The Revolution of 1848 brought with it the dissolution of the Ludlam, known then as the Soupiritum. The Baumannshöhle took its place, but it was not as exclusive in its choice of members as the Ludlam had been, nor did it restrict its activities to its own meetings. The members used to entertain with songs and poetic recitals in the salons of Vienna. The guiding spirits of the Baumannshöhle were Bauernfeld and Baron Todesco, a brother-in-law of Josefine Wertheimstein.⁷ Having withdrawn more and more from social activities, Grillparzer was a less interested member of the group than before. Occasionally, he came out of his gradually increasing seclusion, to attend a meeting. This was, however, in the capacity of an onlooker, rather than as a participant. Since the mere presence of his erstwhile friend and protégé, Bauernfeld, annoyed him in those days, and since he had by that time gained the reputation for being a recluse, this is not at all surprising.⁸

When the Concordia was founded in 1840, Grillparzer was invited to become a member. This organization accepted to membership only those who were actively engaged in the free arts, and who were willing to contribute, once a month at least, some fruit of their particular genius. The painters were expected to exhibit

⁶ Cf. also *Gesp.*, III, pp. 291 and 293; *Jhb.*, I, p. 346.

⁷ Sophie Todesco headed a group of women who wanted to present Grillparzer with an album containing illustrations of his works for his 80th birthday. The illness of Moritz von Schwind, who was to be the artist, caused a change of plans. *Gesp.*, XV, pp. 291ff. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 303 for other plans to honor Grillparzer.

⁸ Foglar, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

their works, the poets to read their poetry, the musicians to give concerts. The members of Concordia met regularly and spent their evenings in informal social activities. A large part of their meeting was usually given over to discussions of politics, literature, the theatre, censorship, and other topics of interest.

Although the government did not look with any more favor upon the existence of this liberal organization than it did upon the Ludlam, it tolerated it. The fact that Grillparzer, who was by that time regarded as a great writer, belonged to it, lent it a certain prestige in Viennese circles. Since the Concordia group was very careful in its choice of members, and since it was commonly known that only people of merit belonged to it, it was considered a great honor to be accepted to membership. Creative ability was not, however, the sole basis for a bid to membership. A candidate's reputation was an important factor. Thus, when the notorious and daring critic, Saphir, wanted to join this select group, he was turned down.⁹ The reason for this will become clearer when we examine Grillparzer's relationship with Saphir.

Grillparzer met as many Jews in the Concordia as in the Ludlamshöhle. His contacts with the Jewish members of the former were, however, more intimate and of much longer duration. Due to the fact that Concordia was much more exclusive, its Jewish members, too, were far superior to those of Ludlam. Among these were the writer Frankl, the composer Dessauer, the pianist Moscheles, the journalist Witthauer, the financier Wertheimer, the dramatist Mosenthal, and many others. Grillparzer was on very friendly terms with all these men and had ample opportunity for close contact with them. The esteem in which they, as well as the other members of Concordia, held Grillparzer, is best indicated by his friend and biographer Frankl: "Alle schwiegen, wenn Grillparzer zu reden begann, die meisten seiner Tischreden, die nicht selten von Humor gefärbt waren, seine kritischen Widerlegungen fesselten alle Anwesenden."¹⁰

At the suggestion of Frankl, who edited the *Sonntagsblätter*,

⁹ It was Grillparzer who made the motion against Saphir's becoming a member. Bauernfeld seconded it. Eduard Bauernfeld, "Aus Alt- und Neu-Wien", *Ausgewählte Werke*, IV, p. 94.

¹⁰ *Zur Biographie F. Grillparzers*, p. 8.

at one time under the editorship of Grillparzer's dramatic mentor, Schreyvogel, Concordia paid homage to Grillparzer's genius by celebrating his birthday on January 15, 1844. "Niemals früher wurde in Wien ein Dichter so geehrt," writes Frankl in his memoirs.¹¹ Grillparzer was presented with an album which contained tributes from all the outstanding people who knew and honored him. Among the poems in this *Festalbum* are many written by prominent Jews. Particularly noteworthy are the ones by Mosen-thal,¹² Frankl,¹³ Witthauer,¹⁴ Dessauer,¹⁵ Moscheles,¹⁶ and Wert-heimer.¹⁷ Four years later, during the March Revolution, the Concordia was disbanded.

It is an interesting phenomenon that for years before the complete emancipation of the Jews, the Jewish salons of Vienna dominated the social and intellectual spheres to such an extent that the greatest dignitaries in every field of endeavor were frequent guests there. Racial prejudices did not exist in these high circles, which attained their prominence in the 'thirties. Before that time, during the first two decades of the 19th century, it was in the home of Caroline Pichler that the *haute monde* of Vienna gathered. It was in her salon that the young and reticent Grillparzer made his social début after the production of *Die Ahnfrau*. It was there, too, that he came in contact with many Jews because Caroline Pichler was on intimate terms with the most prominent Jewish families of Vienna.¹⁸ Regarding the important position which she occupied, we read in Frankl's *Erinnerungen*: "C. Pichler hielt gleichsam literarischen Hof, die geistige und die Geburts-Aristokratie wetteiferte, sich der auch durch jede Frauen—und Bürgertugend ausgezeichneten Dame vorstellen zu lassen. Es galt als Zeugnis für Geist und feine Sitte, Zutritt in ihrem Kreis zu

¹¹ *Erinnerungen*, p. 260.

¹² W. III, 2, p. 269.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

¹⁸ Caroline Pichler was a particularly good friend of Madame von Vlies, a sister of Baroness von Eskeles. In her *Denkwürdigkeiten*, I, p. 326, she writes: "Viele angenehme Stunden habe ich in ihrem Hause verlebt, viele anziehende Bekanntschaften dort gemacht, durch sie ward unsere Familie dem Arnstein'schen Hause . . . genähert, und ich kam nun sehr oft in diese glänzenden Häuser von Arnstein, Pereira und Eskeles."

haben."¹⁹ Her standing was such that when Madame de Staël visited Vienna in 1808, she had to be received by Caroline Pichler before the doors of Vienna's best homes were open to her.

Grillparzer apparently liked the atmosphere which prevailed in the Pichler salon, because he went there regularly every Tuesday and Thursday evening, and frequently on Sunday, too.²⁰ Gradually, however, he transferred his interest to the salons of the Jewish financiers, Eskeles, Arnstein-Pereira, and Wertheimstein. By 1830 the Pichler house had definitely surrendered its prominent position to the three above-mentioned salons.

Both Grillparzer and Bauernfeld were frequent guests at the Wertheimstein home which was presided over by the beautiful and brilliant Josefine von Wertheimstein. When Bauernfeld met her in 1843 for the first time, he wrote in his diary: "So viel Schönheit und Anmut findet man nicht bald wieder. . . . Ihr Organ ist bezaubernd, wie ihr jungfräuliches Erröten."²¹ Grillparzer, too, thought very highly of her. Years later, when he no longer cared to leave the peaceful atmosphere of his home and had completely severed his contact with Bauernfeld, Pollhammer asked him for the reason for this coldness toward Bauernfeld. Grillparzer paid the following tribute to Josefine in his reply to Pollhammer, who had met Bauernfeld in the Wertheimstein salon in 1862: "Er verkehrt nur in Kreisen der hohen Finanzwelt. Von diesen habe ich mich schon lange zurückgezogen, und denke nur mit Verehrung an Frau Josefine v. Wertheimstein, welche ich als eine edle geistreiche Frau voll Herzensgüte kennen lernte."²²

Grillparzer's association with the Pereira family began around the year 1820 and extended for over thirty years. He was on par-

¹⁹ P. 105.

²⁰ Pichler, *op. cit.*, II, p. 114.

²¹ *Tagebücher*, p. 101. In his book, *Die Wiener Juden*, Sigmund Meyer quotes at great length from a booklet of a Christian admirer of Josefine, Felicie Ewarts, p. 364: "Sie hatte von der Natur das Feengeschick einer ungewöhnlichen, durch mädchenhaften Ausdruck in den Zügen noch erhöhten Schönheit erhalten, die selbst dem Alter widerstand. Mit dieser Schönheit verband sich ein reicher Geist, höchste Bildung, Wärme des Gefühls, die es ihr möglich machte, sich den verschiedensten Geistesrichtungen derer, die sich um sie versammelten, in geradezu genialer Weise anzupassen."

²² "Aus den Erinnerungen des Dichters Josef Pollhammer," *Jhb.* XXVIII, p. 105.

ticularly friendly terms with the Baroness Henriette von Pereira-Arnstein. In a letter, which has since been dated by Sauer as of 1820, he sends her a poem entitled *Das elegante Frühstück im Kuhstall*. The concluding paragraph is particularly significant. "Ich konnte mich nicht entschliessen Ihr Schuldner *hierin* noch länger zu sein—in so vielen andern werd' ich es wohl bleiben müssen, so lange ich lebe—daher wollte ich lieber meine Schuld sogleich senden, als nach einigen Tagen selbst bringen."²³ For a man of Grillparzer's sincerity and aversion to meaningless polite phrases to speak of lifelong indebtedness would mean that he was actually very grateful to her and that he held her in high esteem.

Henriette von Pereira was undoubtedly very proud of her association with Grillparzer. She must have written to her friend Lea Mendelssohn-Bartholdy about it, for in a letter written on February 4, 1822 from Berlin, the latter stated: "Ich muss es freilich für mich bedauern, dass Du nur Grillparzer als Representanten aller Dichter um Dich hast. Du brauchst aber nicht genügsam zu sein, um Dich mit solchem Musenlieblinge zu befriedigen. Ich glaube nicht, dass (Goethe ausgenommen) jetzt in Deutschland jemand existiert, der fähig wäre, zwei so vortreffliche Gedichte zu liefern als die, mit welchen er die neueste 'Aglaia' geschmückt hat."²⁴ (The poems referred to are: *An die tragische Muse* and *Bei der Wiege eines Kindes*.) Four years later, when Grillparzer was in Germany, he went to visit Lea Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, possibly at the suggestion of the Baroness Henriette von Pereira. This assumption is supported by the fact that soon after Grillparzer's visit Lea Mendelssohn-Bartholdy wrote a long letter about him to her friend in Vienna. After telling her how happy she was to meet Grillparzer and how favorably he impressed her, she added: "Sein Gespräch ist ebenso gehaltvoll wie natürlich und ich habe keinen wahrhaft bescheideneren Dichter gesehen. Schade, dass er so leidend aussieht und überhaupt verstimmt, in seiner Lage un-

²³ A. Sauer, "Neue Beiträge zum Verständnis und zur Würdigung einiger Gedichte Grillparzers," p. 353. In this article Sauer points out that *Das elegante Frühstück im Kuhstall* was wrongly interpreted and dated by Fr. von Ritzky in his *Grillparzer-Album* because he did not know of the letter which accompanied the poem. Another poem, *Die Viel-Liebchen der Doppel-Mandel* also written to the same person was wrongly ascribed by Ritzky.

²⁴ *Gesp.*, III, pp. 167 f.

behaglich erscheint. Er hat hier allenthalben einen sehr günstigen Eindruck gemacht; auch bei Goethe, dessen Äusserungen über ihn ich gelesen habe."²⁵

Unfortunately for Lea Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, the impression she made upon Grillparzer was far from favorable. Although he liked her husband, the son of Lessing's friend Moses Mendelssohn, and considered him superior to the Jews of Vienna, he could hardly refrain from insulting her. "Ich sass neben Madame; einmal konnte ich kaum widerstehen, ihr tüchtige Grobheiten zu sagen. Eine thätliche wäre mir fast noch näher gelegen," he wrote after his visit.²⁶ The annoyance which she caused him may well have accounted for his discomfort and depressed spirits, about which she wrote to her friend, although his behavior as a whole was in keeping with his shy and morose nature.

During the years preceding the Revolution of 1848, Grillparzer had withdrawn from the circle in which he formerly moved. The additional fact that he was no longer writing for the public, brought with it a lack of interest in his dramas, so that they were not produced for some time. In 1835 Bauernfeld complained that Grillparzer was disappearing more and more from society and in 1841 he felt that Grillparzer was living only for himself.²⁷ In spite of his aversion to social activities, Grillparzer remained in contact with the Pereira family. It was chiefly due to the efforts of Henriette von Pereira and Josefine von Wertheimstein that the interest of the Vienna public in Grillparzer was re-awakened after the revolution, so that Laube again began to produce his dramas. After the successful production of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* in 1851, which Grillparzer witnessed in part, recognition and many honors followed in quick succession. Although Grillparzer felt that it was too late to revive the ardor of his inspiration, and although he was aware of the irony which brought him acclaim when he no longer cared, he was still grateful to his friends for their loyalty. He continued to correspond with Henriette's daughter, Flora Fries, for years and considered her a fine woman.²⁸

²⁵ *Gesp.*, III, p. 304.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 74 and 06.

²⁶ W. II, 8, p. 241.

²⁸ W. III, 3, p. 52.

Grillparzer was also a frequent guest in the salon of Josef Wertheimer, before his complete withdrawal from social activity. It was there that he made many valuable contacts, including some Jewish ones. This salon had attained the great prominence which was once reserved for the salon of Caroline Pichler. Among the people who came to Wertheimer's home, in addition to Grillparzer, were Hammer-Purgstall, Feuchtersleben, Seligman, Frankl, Bauernfeld, Kuranda, Lorm, Holbein, Laube, Witthauer, Baumeister, and Betty Paoli. Since racial prejudices did not exist in this, as well as the other salons of the time, Grillparzer had an opportunity to observe the free and friendly association between Jews and Christians.

Josef Wertheimer is representative of the best in Vienna Jewry as Grillparzer knew it. His family settled in Austria in the 14th century, and played an important part in the history of the Jews. The family name varies between Wertheimer, Wertheimber, Wertheimstein and Wertheim.²⁹ In 1796, Salomon Josef Wertheimer married Marianne Oppenheim of Berlin. This marriage served as a precedent for Metternich in 1847 when the Prussian government inquired whether Austrian laws permitted the marriage of an Austrian Jew to a Prussian Jewess. On the basis of the Wertheimer union, Metternich answered in the affirmative.

Josef Wertheimer, the son of this couple, chose a business career rather than a profession, although his interests lay elsewhere. The existing prejudices made it well nigh impossible for a Jew to be anything else but a merchant. Throughout his life he was intensely interested in learning and child education. With the help and support of Caroline Pichler, whose husband had an important government position, he was instrumental in the establishment of a "Kinderbewahranstalt" in Vienna in 1830. This school proved such a success that others were opened with Wertheimer as chief supervisor. Indefatigable in his efforts to ameliorate the lot of the Jews, he finally obtained permission in 1848 to found a similar school for Jewish children. Since Jews were not permitted to acquire property, it was as a reward for his public service that the government allowed him to build such a school.

²⁹ *Vide ante*, p. 12. For further details, see Gerson Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien*.

He was the secretary of the Jewish Community from 1834 to 1838. In that year he was elected to a higher office and his post was taken over by Ludwig August Frankl.³⁰ In order to help the Jews to earn a living, he directed them into various trades not closed to them by law. He wanted them to become productive members of the community. In an effort to bring about their emancipation, he wrote a book in 1842, entitled: *Die Juden in Oesterreich vom Standpunkte der Geschichte, des Rechtes und des Staatsvorteils*. Since the Austrian censors would not have permitted its publication, the MS. had to be smuggled into Germany, where Kuranda, the editor of *Die Grenzboten*, attended to its publication. To save himself any difficulties with the censorship authorities, who prohibited foreign printing of uncensored material, he published the book anonymously. As a belated reward for his unceasing efforts in behalf of the Jews, the Emperor knighted Wertheimer in 1868.

Association with men like Wertheimer and Frankl who played such important rôles in the Jewish Community, would make a man of Grillparzer's avowed liberal tendencies, aware of the problems of the Jews. There are, among others, two entries in his diary which testify to his interest in the history of the Jews. They were written in 1834 and 1835 when he was already acquainted with Frankl and Wertheimer. The first entry is made in connection with Grillparzer's reading of a history of Hungary: "Juden unter Ludwig dem Grossen aus Ungarn vertrieben, unter Siegmund wieder aufgenommen."³¹ The second is an attempt to trace the evolution of the Jewish ghetto and indicates an awareness of the miserable living conditions there.³² There is no mention of the source of his information, nor of the circumstances which prompted him to make this entry. It is quite likely that he read something dealing with the Vienna ghetto, although no book title is given. Another possibility is that he obtained his information from Wertheimer or Frankl. Grillparzer seems to have been particularly interested in the Jews at that time. In 1834 he also read and took notes on Hüllmann's *Die Staatsverfassung der Israel-*

³⁰ Gerson Wolf, *Josef Wertheimer*, p. 42.

³¹ W. II, o, p. 191.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 304.

iten which had just been published in Leipzig.³³ The fact that his contacts with Jews were very numerous in the 'thirties may account in part for this interest.

While there is a great deal of material on Grillparzer's social and literary contacts with Jews, there is very little information about his business relations with them. Beginning with the year 1819 he used letters of credit from the banking firm of Arnstein and Eskeles, both of whom he knew socially. It is safe to assume that Grillparzer was satisfied with their services, since he continued to use the same firm whenever he made an extended trip.³⁴ He apparently also borrowed money on occasion from this firm. In a letter written on May 12, 1824, Grillparzer asked for a loan of 100 florins to meet an unexpected payment.³⁵ Nothing further is indicated by him concerning any other business dealings.

Grillparzer's contact with Ludwig August Frankl was both of a literary and of a social nature. Their friendship extended over a period of years and was terminated by Grillparzer's death. Frankl was one of the finest and most gifted men that Grillparzer knew. One has but to read the comment of Adolf Bartels on Frankl to appreciate that. "Dieser 1876 als Ritter von Hochwart geadelte k.k. Schulrat, Präses der israelitischen Kultusgemeinde und 'Nasi des heiligen Landes,' ist der angesehenste österreichisch-jüdische Dichter seiner Zeit gewesen. . . . Er gehört zu den Juden, über die einmal auch ein Deutscher ausführlicher schreiben muss."³⁶ Considering the source of this statement, this is indeed a significant tribute to Frankl.

Like Josef Wertheimer, Frankl came from a large family whose members lived for centuries in Austria and Germany. They also played an important part in the history of the Jews. When Emperor Leopold issued his edict of expulsion in the 17th century, the Frankl family paid the city of Vienna 4000 silver gulden to leave the Jewish cemetery unmolested. Frankl's great-grandfather

³³ W. II, 9, pp. 150ff. Grillparzer gives the title incorrectly as *Staatsverfassung der Hebräer*.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 1, p. 176; III, 2, pp. 151, 154, 175.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 1, p. 431. Although no addressee is given, Sauer believes that the letter was meant for the head of the firm of Arnstein & Eskeles, or possibly for Heinrich Pereira.

³⁶ *Jüdische Herkunft und Literaturwissenschaft*, p. 71.

settled in Prague where he became the *Primator* of the Jewish Community. One of his grandsons, the father of Ludwig August, had the government tobacco concession in Chrast, Bohemia, where Ludwig August was born on February 3, 1810. Since he was primarily interested in acquiring a knowledge of languages, a Catholic priest of the town offered him free lessons in Latin. This was not at all strange in a small town like Chrast where the Jewish and Christian inhabitants lived in close proximity and maintained friendly relations unaffected by racial intolerance. The orthodox parents of young Frankl gladly accepted the priest's offer and frequently showed their appreciation by gifts of their choicest cigars.

In addition to Latin, Frankl also learned German perfectly, and spent most of his time reading poetry. He also read Grillparzer's *Ahnfrau* and was so thrilled by it that he memorized it in its entirety. Although his main interest was literature, he matriculated in medicine at the University of Vienna, since this was the only profession open to Jews at the time. He did not, however, stop reading and writing poetry. One of the poems he published brought him an interview with the Emperor, as well as Raimund's advice to devote himself more to poetry.

When Frankl was being received by the Emperor, Grillparzer was in the waiting room, but whereas Frankl was jubilant, Grillparzer was acrimonious and disappointed. The drama with which he hoped to improve his standing in the court had been misunderstood, so that *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn* seemed to have displeased the Emperor, even though he offered to indemnify Grillparzer for the withdrawal of the work from the stage. The indifferent reception of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* did not help matters much. Ironically enough, the Emperor advised Grillparzer to write something humorous, and told Frankl to apply for a professorship. When the latter answered that he could not, the Emperor thought that he had not passed the necessary examinations. Frankl then told him that he was a Jew and, therefore, disqualified. To this the Emperor said "Ach so!" and offered to grant him any favor he wanted. Frankl asked for a pass to the *Kaiserliches Theater*, which he received in addition to a ticket for the *Hofoper* for life.³⁷

³⁷ Eugen Wolbe, *Ludwig August Frankl*, p. 27.

After receiving his doctor's degree in 1837 from the University of Padua, then under Austrian rule, Frankl traveled for six months and then tried in vain for a position in the royal library. There was no opportunity for a Jew in that field. A year later he became secretary to the Jewish Community. Like his friend Wertheimer, he wrote a book on the history of the Jews in Vienna. His most important work, however, began in 1842 when he took over the editorship of the famous *Sonntagsblätter*. This was the only publication of its kind in Vienna and counted Grillparzer, Lenau, Grün, Bauernfeld, and Heine among its contributors. It carried such weight in Vienna literary circles that its publication of Hebbel's biography and one of his poems was sufficient to bring about his popularity with the Viennese public. As a direct result of the friendly reception which the *Sonntagsblätter* accorded Hebbel, a friendship of long standing developed between Frankl and Hebbel.

Sedlnitzky, who plagued Grillparzer with his incessant suspicions, also caused Frankl many difficulties. In his memoirs, the latter relates that he had applied for permission to publish his paper twice weekly instead of once. Although the Emperor was willing, because, as he said, it would give him an opportunity to read this paper more often, Sedlnitzky was against the idea. In spite of Frankl's frequent inquiries, and in spite of the Emperor's repeated orders to Sedlnitzky to grant the permission, Frankl finally had to give up hope. Sedlnitzky merely kept him waiting for a disposition of the case.³⁸

Like Wertheimer, Frankl was very active in behalf of the Jews. In 1856 he went to Jerusalem to found a school for Jewish children of Austrian birth. His great interest in education, in the cause of which he was untiring, led to his election in 1871 to the position of *Schulrat* of Vienna. He was, as we have seen, also knighted by the Emperor. Both Frankl and Wertheimer were beloved and respected members of the social and literary circles in which they moved.

Frankl's association with Grillparzer began in the early 'thirties. They met often in the clubs and in the salons which they

³⁸ *Erinnerungen*, pp. 172ff.

both frequented. As late as 1870 when the aged Grillparzer rarely left his house, he visited Frankl.³⁹ Very often they discussed their works. It was to Frankl that he gave some very interesting reasons for his failure to complete *Esther*. These will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. On one occasion, when Frankl talked to him about his epic poem *Der Primator*, Grillparzer made the following comment: "Es ist ein grausam erhabener Stoff, den Sie zum Vorwurf Ihres Gedichtes gewählt haben. Aber die Zeiten solchen Martyriums der Juden, solcher entsetzlichen Thaten, wo der Sohn den Vater auf das Geheiss der Rabbiner tödtet, weil er zum Christenthume übergetreten ist, und wo eine entmenschte Horde, im Namen Christi, Raub, Mord und Brand an den Juden begeht, sind vorüber. Solche Zeiten sind unserer Theilnahme entrückt, um so mehr muss ich die Kunst und Gestaltungskraft anerkennen mit der Sie u.s.w."⁴⁰ (Frankl does not finish the statement.) Apparently Grillparzer felt that the cause of religious tolerance was so far advanced that the gruesome theme of *Der Primator* would not strike a vital chord in the enlightened public of 19th century Vienna. It is interesting to note that Frankl found the material on which he based his poem in an old Prague Chronicle where his great-grandfather was once the *Primator*.

Of the many Jewish women whom Grillparzer knew, Betty Paoli was, from a literary point of view, the most important.⁴¹ She was a frequent contributor of poetry and literary criticisms to the contemporary periodicals. Grillparzer met her in the Wertheimer home, since she was the companion of Josef Wertheimer's wife. Betty Paoli admired Grillparzer's genius a great deal and made it the object of her praise in both prose and poetry. He appreciated her devotion and her own poetic talent, since he considered her a greater lyric poet than Lenau or Anastasius Grün.⁴² Regarding Grillparzer's reaction to Betty Paoli's friendship, we read in an article written by a friend and contemporary of both:

³⁹ *Gesp.*, XV, p. 290.

⁴⁰ *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzers*, pp. 26f.

⁴¹ Her real name was Elisabeth Glück; the daughter of a doctor, she was born in Vienna on Dec. 30, 1815 and died in Baden on July 5, 1894. For biographical notes on her own life, see *Jhb.* XVIII, pp. 202ff.

⁴² Helene, Bettelheim-Gabillon, "Zur Charakteristik Betty Paolis," *Jhb.*, X, p. 108.

"Der Meister hat diese Gesinnungen durch treue Freundschaft und Würdigung ihrer dichterischen Grösse erwidert. . . ." ⁴³

In 1875 Betty Paoli published a critical study of Grillparzer's works in which she extolled his great dramatic genius. Before that, she had written a very favorable article about him in *Die Neue Freie Presse*. What she thought of Grillparzer, the man, is best shown in the following words: "Ich habe im Laufe meines vielbewegten Lebens Niemanden gekannt, der an Reiz der Unterhaltung Grillparzer überboten hätte. . . . Grillparzers Liebenswürdigkeit war so gross, dass selbst seine verdriesslichen Stimmungen—und daran fehlte es nicht—etwas von ihrem Gepräge annehmen mussten. Sie entsprang vor allem einer grossen Güte," she stated. ⁴⁴ According to her, those who considered Grillparzer an egotist were doing him an injustice. He was merely much too absorbed in his own thoughts to be disconcerted by the petty affairs of those about him, she felt. In spite of the fact that Betty Paoli was aware of Grillparzer's failings, she remained one of his staunchest admirers all through the years.

Like Wertheimer and Frankl, Betty Paoli was conscious of her Jewish heritage and smarted under the intolerance which the Jews encountered. In a letter to Leopold Kompert, whom she met in the Wertheimer house, and whom she admired because of his militant fight for Jewish equality, she praised his book, *Aus dem Ghetto*, adding "Unserer Zeit fehlt die Liebe; was die sogenannten Volksfreunde dafür ausgeben möchten, ist nur ein verschleierter Hass, ein Hass, der doppelt empören muss, weil er sich mit Heuchelei paart." ⁴⁵ For a woman who abhorred hypocrisy and bigotry as she did, to admire Grillparzer throughout her life would mean that she was convinced of his humane and friendly attitude toward her co-religionists. Grillparzer was too sincere and guileless a person to have been able to mask successfully any anti-Semitism he might have felt over the long period of his association with Betty Paoli. The fact that she wanted Kompert to meet Grillparzer proves further that she must have been sure of Grillparzer's friendliness. In an invitation to Kompert written in 1854,

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁴⁵ S. Hock, "Briefe Betty Paolis an Leopold Kompert," *Jhb.* XVIII, p. 180.

she stated: "Sie werden ausser Grillparzer keinen Fremden finden und *seine* Bekanntschaft wird Ihnen hoffentlich erwünscht sein."⁴⁶ Knowing Kompert's sensitive nature, she would hardly have exposed him to any possible slights at the hands of unfriendly Christians. We must, therefore, assume that she ran no such risk with Grillparzer.

The first edition of Grillparzer's works was published in 1872 by Laube and Josef Weilen, the latter of whom was a very prominent writer and a converted Jew. We have seen that Grillparzer associated intimately with people like Frankl, Wertheimer and Betty Paoli who fought for the emancipation of the Jews. We shall now examine his contact with a Jew who sought to escape the stigma of his race by means of conversion.⁴⁷ Grillparzer was first attracted to Weilen by the latter's poetry which he considered very promising. In 1854 he praised Weilen highly in a letter to the publisher Wilhelm Braumüller.⁴⁸ When Weilen completed his drama *Tristan und Isolde* in 1859, he asked Grillparzer for permission to dedicate it to him. Grillparzer promptly replied that he was both honored and pleased to accept this distinction, but that he doubted the wisdom of dedicating this drama to the author of *Die Ahnfrau*, as this would tend to revive the fate question and cause the critics to overlook the real merit of Weilen's work.⁴⁹ In spite of this advice, Grillparzer received a copy of *Tristan und Isolde* and found that Weilen had dedicated it to him.

Grillparzer had a very high opinion of Weilen according to Pollhammer: "Für Josef Weilen empfand er grosse Sympathie, und verfolgte seine poetische Laufbahn mit dem grössten Interesse. Er hielt ihn für einen Mann von wahren, offenem Charakter mit der besten idealen Anlage, und als das habe ich auch Weilen kennen gelernt, und kann nur die Richtigkeit des Urtheils bestätigen."⁵⁰ During the long years of his association with Weilen,

⁴⁶ Hock, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁴⁷ Josef von Weilen was born in a small town near Prague on Dec. 28, 1828 and died in Vienna on July 3, 1889. His most important dramatic works are: *Tristan, Edda, Drahomira*, and *Rosamunde*.

⁴⁸ W. III, 3, p. 140.

⁴⁹ W., p. 216.

⁵⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 89. Weilen visited Grillparzer on the day he died. "Halb 3 Uhr Nachmittag starb Österreichs, Deutschlands grösster Dichter," he wrote in his diary. (*Gesp.* XX, p. 104.)

Grillparzer exchanged many visits with him and was the godfather of one of Weilen's children. In 1867 Weilen arranged, with the coöperation of the Fröhlich sisters, to have a statue made of Grillparzer. It was Weilen, as we have seen, who published Grillparzer's works shortly after his death, and thus presented to the world for the first time the three great posthumous works: *Libussa*, *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg*, and *Die Jüdin von Toledo*.

Grillparzer's contact with the Lieben family began in 1859 and lasted until his death. He met the Liebens during his sojourn in Römerbad and saw them quite often, particularly in the year following.⁵¹ His interest extended to all the members of the family, including young Adolf Lieben in whose behalf he interceded, unasked, with Minister von Thun in order to further his career.⁵² In spite of the great difference in their ages he was very much interested in Adolf's studies, invited him to his house often, and spent hours in conversation with him.⁵³ According to Helene Lieben, the aged poet and the young science student discussed religion, philosophy, and science, and Grillparzer on all occasions expressed liberal and unprejudiced views.⁵⁴ Grillparzer dined often with the Liebens and was visited by them in return. When Rosa Lieben was sick, he called in person to inquire about her. The entire family called on Grillparzer to offer their felicitations on his 69th birthday and also on his 70th.⁵⁵ Ten years later when on his 80th birthday Sophie Todesco planned to honor Grillparzer with the Schwind illustrations, Helen Lieben was one of the women eager to pay homage to Grillparzer.⁵⁶

Grillparzer met Salomon Mosenthal at a meeting of the Concordia in 1841. Mosenthal's reading of one of his many poems, *Die Null*, attracted Grillparzer's attention to him and a close friendship developed between the two, particularly after Mosenthal's

⁵¹ *Gesp.*, XII, p. 150, pp. 324ff; cf. also pp. 176-184, 208ff., 218, 248.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 182. Adolf Lieben was born in Vienna on December 3, 1836.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 150; cf. also p. 154.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 168, 182, 246. On one such occasion they met Weilen and Betty Paoli there (p. 168).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, XX, p. 81; cf. also pp. 91f. XV, pp. 201ff., 303. Helene Lieben (married Anspitz) published "Erinnerungen an Grillparzer" in *Die Neue Freie Presse* on February 2, 1872. Among the friends who remained loyal to Grillparzer until his death, Sauer lists Helene Lieben. The others are: Josephine v. Knorr, Frau v. Litrow, Foglar, Frankl, Laube and Weilen. (*Gesp.*, XX, p. vi.)

tribute to Grillparzer in the *Festalbum* of 1844. Mosenthal reports that Grillparzer frequently climbed up the many flights of stairs to the Mosenthal home to spend a few hours "im vertraulichen Plaudern."⁵⁷ He also attended their evening musicales. This is indicative of his warm friendship toward the Mosenthals, in view of his known aversion to social functions and crowds generally. It was at the request of Mosenthal's wife that Grillparzer consented to attend the performance of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* in 1851. After having for over thirty years kept his pledge not to attend the performance of any of his works, he broke it to attend this particular performance with the Mosenthals. During the first two acts Grillparzer was keenly interested, during the third he disappeared. When Mosenthal asked him on the next day why he left so abruptly before the best Hero scene, he replied: "Ich war müde und abgespannt und, um die Wahrheit zu sagen, da hatte mir der Anschütz vier Zeilen weggelassen, die ihm wahrscheinlich der Laube gestrichen hat, und da bin ich mir vorgekommen, als läge ich bei lebendigem Leib auf dem Seziertisch."⁵⁸ It was a similar reaction during the first staging of *Die Ahnfrau* in 1817, that caused him to resolve never to witness the production of his dramas.

Mosenthal, who considered himself a disciple of Grillparzer, always sought the master's opinion regarding his works. After he had completed his most significant *Tendenzdrama*, *Deborah*, he anxiously awaited Grillparzer's verdict, only to find that he objected to the Jewish angle of the drama. Since Mosenthal regarded this as the most important part, he, no doubt, was surprised by Grillparzer's criticism. "Sie hätten keine Jüdin draus machen sollen, das Tendenziöse ist eine Frage, die sich bald überlebt. Mir wäre eine Zigeunerin oder sonst ein vagabundierendes Mädel lieber gewesen; dann hätte das Reinmenschliche des Konfliktes allein gewirkt."⁵⁹ This reaction is similar to the one he had in connection with Frankl's *Primator*, and definitely shows his aversion to *Tendenz*.

⁵⁷ *Gesp.*, I, p. 202. In his diary Grillparzer once wrote: "Ich bin für die Gesellschaft verdorben. Ich kann mit niemand sprechen, an dem ich keinen Herzensantheil nehme." (W. II, 10, p. 19.)

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Gesp.*, I, p. 205.

The reason for Grillparzer's preference of a gypsy for the heroine of *Deborah* is due to the fact that the subject, as originally expounded to him by Prechtler, dealt with the sorrows of a beautiful gypsy. It was he who possessed the material which he intended to dramatize into an appeal for humane treatment of the gypsies. Prechtler also intended to depict most realistically the trials and tribulations of their life. When he, one day, mentioned his plot to Mosenthal, the latter was so impressed with its possibilities that he was willing to give anything for a chance to dramatize this subject. Since Prechtler had, in the meantime, lost interest in the material, he surrendered it to Mosenthal who changed the gypsy into a Jewess. The entire drama became a plea for the greater understanding of the Jews whose misery Mosenthal depicted vividly.

After Mosenthal had completed *Deborah*, both Grillparzer and Prechtler felt that he should not have brought up the Jewish question. They considered it too controversial and contemporary a problem.⁶⁰ Mosenthal had ample opportunity to find out that they were right. In spite of Laube's efforts in its behalf, it was rejected by Dietrichstein as a "Judenstück" which had no place on the stage of the Burgtheater. Finally, in 1864, Laube staged *Deborah* after being warned that it would be of no interest to the public, since it was no longer a new play and since it dealt with a problem already solved.⁶¹

One of Grillparzer's greatest dramas, *Sappho*, was suggested to him by a Jew, Felix Joel. In 1817 he mentioned to Grillparzer the possibilities of the Sappho story as an opera text for Josef Weigl.⁶² This struck a responsive chord in Grillparzer who was suffering just then from the *malheur d'être poète* brought on by the critical dispute over the fate question in his first drama, *Die Ahnfrau*. The relationship of the creative artist to the rest of the world had become a very personal problem for Grillparzer, so that he was well able to depict Sappho's pathetic attempt to snatch some share of human happiness without giving up the prerogatives of Olym-

⁶⁰ Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn, *Im Jahrhundert Grillparzers*, pp. 44ff.

⁶¹ Heinrich Laube, *Das Burgtheater*, pp. 344f.

⁶² W. I, 16, p. 127. Grillparzer did not heed Joel's suggestion regarding the Weigl text.

pus. The struggle to partake of the joys of everyday life and to retain, at the same time, a detached aloofness from it, was too great for Grillparzer and Sappho. Their failure attests to the unbridgeable gap between the Tassos and Antonios, the Tonio Krögers and Hans Hansens of the world.

Feeling Sappho's problem keenly, he was able to write the entire drama in three weeks. The creation of this great work served to clarify his own confused emotions at the time. The critical attack on his *Ahnfrau* had bewildered him and robbed him of self-confidence. He was even pathetically grateful to Müllner for the latter's friendly attitude toward his first drama. The very successful staging of *Sappho* by Schreyvogel on April 21, 1818 served to remove some of the bitterness and disappointment which Grillparzer felt over the reception of *Die Ahnfrau*.

Of the four writers named Jeitteles, who were prominent in the 19th century, Grillparzer had most contact with Aloys, a doctor and critic of some repute. Both he and Ignaz Jeitteles were members of Ludlam.⁶³ It was Aloys Jeitteles who first referred to *Die Ahnfrau* as a fate tragedy and who was the co-author of one of the deadliest of the numerous parodies which appeared after its publication. This parody was called *Der Schicksalsstrumpf* and the authors were given as the brothers Fatalis. The fact that it was written by Castelli and Jeitteles was well known. Although Castelli boasted of having written the major part of it, it was Jeitteles who was really responsible for most of the work.⁶⁴ In 1843 Castelli openly admitted in Frankl's *Sonntagsblätter* that he and Jeitteles were the authors of *Der Schicksalsstrumpf*.

Jeitteles published his attack on *Die Ahnfrau* in the *Wiener Modenzeitung*. He stated that the drama was too important for every schoolboy to try to write one, adding that whoever could not write a real tragedy, should not write anything. He also compared the fate tragedy of the Romantic school with the drama of antiquity and with Calderon, whose works he had translated.⁶⁵ Grillparzer's answer to this attack was an article entitled *Erklärung*

⁶³ *Gesp.*, III, pp. 147 and 449.

⁶⁴ Costenoble, *Aus dem Burgtheater*, II, p. 97.

⁶⁵ W. I., 14, The Anmerkungen, pp. 225ff., contain a reprint of the Jeitteles article which appeared in Nr. 24, March 22, 1817.

gegen die Kritiker des Trauerspiels, Die Ahnfrau. In a scathing and contemptuous tone, he accuses Jeitteles of appropriating Schlegel's ideas and of writing "Hirnverbranntes Gewäsch."⁶⁶ After dismissing the Jeitteles criticism as nonsense, Grillparzer expressed the following exhortation: "Übrigens hüte dich künftig vor vorlautem Wesen und ungerufenem Schwatzen, lerne anspruchsloses, bescheidenes Streben an andern schätzen, und ahme ihnen lieber nach als sie mutwillig und (bei deiner Unfähigkeit) nutzlos in ihrem stillen Wirken zu stören. Vor allem aber hüte dich in einem entscheidenden Tone zu sprechen, da was du sprichst nichts entscheidet. Und somit denn, Gott befohlen! Wir beide werden uns, wie ich hoffe nicht mehr sprechen. Dein Tadel ist mir gleichgültig, deine Schmähung verachte ich, dich selbst bedaure ich."⁶⁷

In spite of the many insulting remarks which were exchanged between Grillparzer and Jeitteles, their contact was not broken off. They continued to meet in the Ludlamshöhle and were both present at the reception to Weber in 1823. When *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* was produced in the Burgtheater on April 5, 1831, Jeitteles, unmindful of Grillparzer's advice, criticized it adversely, calling it hollow and worthless.⁶⁸ He was, of course, not alone in his criticism because the drama had to be withdrawn after four performances and was not produced again until 1851. Grillparzer consoled himself at the time by saying that he had risen above the need for public or critical acclaim.

During the hectic years preceding the Revolution of 1848, Grillparzer was vainly exhorted to write patriotic poems. Although he remained loyal to his determination not to write any more for the public, he did write a tribute to the leadership of Radetzky which was published without Grillparzer's authorization. As a result of this poem, he found himself the center of both praise and condemnation. Jeitteles, as one of the conservatives, praised his stand and wrote a poem extolling Grillparzer. The opposition of the liberals, however, outweighed by far the praise of the conservatives. The liberals felt that Grillparzer's poem was a sign of servility. They felt that he had deserted their ranks and attacked

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Costenoble, *op. cit.*, II, p. 53.

him in a series of anonymous articles and poems. One of the liberals, Isidor Heller, a Jewish critic, accused him of stupidity in choosing Radetzky as a subject with which to break his long silence. He condemned Grillparzer for having suffered all his life at the hands of the meddling censors, instead of going to Germany, where he could have written his works in peace, and finished by saying that he did not deserve a better fate than to write servile poems at the time of the long-awaited revolution.⁶⁹ Grillparzer's answer was an epigram in which he referred to himself as sensible, rather than servile.⁷⁰

Another Jeitteles, Itzig Isaak, who wrote under the *nom de plume* of Julius Seidlitz, played a minor part in Grillparzer's life. In 1842 there appeared an anonymous pamphlet, entitled *Oesterreichischer Parnass*, which caused a great stir in Vienna literary circles. In this booklet all the important figures of the day were ridiculed and subjected to the most scurrilous criticism. Regarding Grillparzer, it said: "König Ottokars Glück und Ende—ein tragisches Gelegenheitsgedicht—(ex officio et jussu) zur Verherrlichung der Habsburger! Pfui!"⁷¹

The preface of this pamphlet contained a statement of the publishers Hoffmann & Campe that a "kleines Jüdchen" had given them the manuscript before embarking for Munich to become converted. As a Christian, he explained to them, he wanted to have nothing to do with this pamphlet. A very malicious and detailed description of the supposed author then followed. Since this fit Itzig Jeitteles, he was suspected of having written the booklet. It has been definitely established, however, that the perpetrator of this literary outrage was Uffo Horn, a Christian writer, who hoped to cast suspicion on Jeitteles by means of the spurious description in the preface.⁷²

Grillparzer's association with Emil Kuh began with the latter's

⁶⁹ Wilhelm Bücher, *Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Politik*, pp. 98f. Heller's article appeared in *Der Freimüthige* of June 12, 1848. The Radetzky poem of Grillparzer and the Jeitteles poem appeared within a few days of one another in June 1848 in *Die Konstitutionelle Donauzeitung*.

⁷⁰ *Ante*, p. 9.

⁷¹ S. Hock, "Vormärzliche Pamphlete," *Jhb.* XVII, p. 129.

⁷² For details on the furor created by this pamphlet and for proof of Horn's authorship, cf. W. v. Wurzbach, "Uffo Horn," *Jhb.* XIII, p. 217, also S. Hock, "Vormärzliche Pamphlete," *Jhb.* XVIII, pp. 130ff.

publication of the *Esther* fragment in his *Dichterbuch aus Oesterreich* in 1863. In a letter to Grillparzer, Kuh expressed his admiration of the fragment, declaring that the big scene of the second act was one of the most beautiful in all dramatic literature.⁷³ He also thanked Grillparzer personally for giving him the honor of publishing the fragment for the first time. During their subsequent association, they discussed, among many other things, Grillparzer's decision not to write for publication, a decision which he must have regretted at times.⁷⁴ Grillparzer's dramatic career would, perhaps, have taken a different turn if he had formed the close contact with Kuh that Hebbel had formed. Unfortunately, Grillparzer was over seventy years old and past his creative prime when he met Kuh. The fact that Kuh was such a great admirer of Hebbel toward whom Grillparzer was cool, may have acted as a deterrent from establishing an earlier contact between them.

Little is known of Grillparzer's contact with Moritz Mandl, the editor of *Die Neue Freie Presse*. A few days before Grillparzer's death, Mandl wrote a short biographical sketch about him in which he attempted to explain his hermitlike existence. As a whole his analysis of Grillparzer's personality is correct. He pointed out, among other things, that Grillparzer considered himself misunderstood, and that he withdrew from all personal and literary contacts with the world in order to avoid being even more misunderstood. Mandl also extolled Grillparzer's great love for Austria and regarded it as a sign of his independence and courage that he hailed Radetzky in the storm and stress days of the Revolution of 1848.⁷⁵ Since Grillparzer did not intend the Radetzky poem for publication, no question of courage is, of course, involved.

It is doubtful whether Grillparzer hated any other critic so much as he hated Moritz Saphir, the editor and publisher of the *Humorist*. He met Saphir in 1826 through Hegel and this was the only time, as he writes in his autobiography, that he was ever under the same roof with him.⁷⁶ Yet for many succeeding years

⁷³ Grillparzer Briefe, *Jhb.* I, p. 415. Letter of August 25, 1862.

⁷⁴ Emil Kuh, *Zwei Dichter Oesterreichs*, p. 144, also p. 186.

⁷⁵ The Mandl sketch is reprinted in *Gesp.*, I, pp. 166ff. It originally appeared in *Die Neue Freie Presse*, Jan. 11, 1871. (Nr. 2290 Feuilleton.)

⁷⁶ W. I, 16, p. 188.

Grillparzer suffered from the vitriolic attacks of Saphir, and finally resorted to writing epigrams about him to give vent to his hatred for this man. To understand Saphir's ability to hurt Grillparzer, we must know something of the Vienna newspapers before the Revolution of 1848.

The newspapers of the *Vormärz* were far removed from any present day conception of a newspaper. Their *raison d'être* was not to supply news, but to amuse a rather superficial and easily entertained reading public. The main part of the paper was the novel, published in installments, followed by very lengthy reports and criticisms of theatrical productions in the five theatres in Vienna, and of those in the provinces. Because of the strict censorship, very little could be said about political events. To avoid any difficulties with the authorities, the newspapers carefully avoided any controversial news for fear of offending somebody, and stressed theatrical criticism instead. Thus, the critic was the most important person connected with a journal.

The three big publications of Vienna in the 'thirties were Saphir's *Humorist*, Bäuerle's *Theaterzeitung*, and Witthauer's *Modezeitung*. Their circulation was the biggest in Austria. It was with Saphir that Grillparzer engaged in a bitter feud. He could not have chosen a more dangerous or persistent adversary. Saphir used his journalistic capacity to pay off his grudge against Grillparzer.

Saphir's career took him to the principal cities of central Europe. A Hungarian by birth, Saphir spent his early years in Prague and Vienna where he edited the *Theaterzeitung* in 1823. In Berlin, he founded and edited the *Schnellpost*. Because of a critical attack on Henrietta Sonntag, whom Grillparzer met many years later in 1847 at Meyerbeer's house, he got into difficulties with the government and finally transferred the scene of his activities to Munich, where he edited the *Bazar* in 1829. It was not long before he found himself in trouble here, too. This time it was the Hoftheater that was offended by his caustic criticisms. He next spent some time in Paris where he lectured to a small following. While there, he lived in the same house as Börne and associated with him and Heine. In 1831 he was again in Munich. The Hoftheater had, apparently, forgiven him his previous indiscretion and offered him

the position of Intendanzrat on condition that he become a Christian. Saphir accepted the offer and joined the Protestant Church in 1832. After a few years in Munich, he returned to Vienna and founded the *Humorist* in 1837. He remained its editor until his death in 1858. As critic for the *Humorist*, he had frequent opportunities to plague Grillparzer.

Due to his unscrupulous satire and cruel wit, Saphir had the doubtful distinction of being the most disliked of all dramatic critics. He had so many enemies that a group of them, consisting chiefly of actors and writers, formed an association in Berlin whose sole aim was the literary, if not the actual extinction of Saphir. One member of this group, an actor named Angeli, took the extinction part literally and actually intended to kill Saphir. This resulted in a court trial, which brought Saphir the publicity he always sought.⁷⁷ The man thrived on sensational tactics, which his reading public expected of him.

The feud between Saphir and Grillparzer began in 1835 because of an article written by Bauernfeld, who was, at the time, still a close friend of Grillparzer. In this article entitled *Kritik und Kritiker unserer Zeit*, Bauernfeld attacked the tendencies of the contemporary critics to be piquant and witty at the expense of truth. "Die Menschen haben es sich einmal angewöhnt, über alles eine Meinung haben zu wollen; die falsche Kritik kommt diesem Drange entgegen. . . . Piquante und geistreiche Äusserungen gefallen stets, sie mögen wahr oder falsch sein; witziger Tadel reizt immer die Schadenfreude," he wrote in part.⁷⁸ Of all the contemporary critics, Saphir felt himself called upon to make an answer, which appeared in the *Theaterzeitung*. He began his article with, "Ein

⁷⁷ Bettelheim-Gabillon, "Amalie Hainzinger-Neumann u. das Wiener Burgtheater," *Jhb.* XI, p. 232. For further details cf. also Glossy, "Aus dem Vormärz," *Jhb.* X, pp. 312ff. Perhaps the most favorable comment on Saphir is made by Dingelstedt, "Die Poesie in Oesterreich," *Jhb.* IX, p. 318: "Saphir ist der Proteus der Literatur, von keiner Seite zu fassen, weil von allen aalglatt, und in keinem Gesichte zu trauen, weil er das Alte im nächsten Augenblick selbst für 'ungeheure Ironie' erklärt, dabei aber ein Kunstrichter, der viel gesehen, und wenn auch nicht von gelehrten Principien ausgehend, doch nach einem natürlichen und gesunden Schönheitsgefühl, das eine reiche Erfahrung geläutert hat, seine Urtheile abgibt, der Schauspieler gefährlicher Feind durch seinen allzeit schlag- und maulfertigen Witz—kurz ein Theaterrecensent, wie es in Deutschland keinen weiter gibt, ernst, wenn es sein muss, lustig so oft er kann, ebenso unterhaltend, wie für die Künstler belehrend."

⁷⁸ *Aufsätze*, p. 181.

recht mittelmässiger Autor hat einmal gesagt: Es war eine schöne Zeit, in der die Kritik noch nicht erfunden war!"⁷⁹ and then proceeded in his usual manner to answer Bauernfeld's charges.

Ironically enough, it was Grillparzer, who hated literary wars so much that he refused to defend his *Ahnfrau* in 1817 against its inclusion in the fate tragedy genre, and not Bauernfeld, who rose to the defense of the original article. Had Grillparzer known what a hornet's nest he was stirring up, he might, perhaps, have refrained from taking up the cudgels for Bauernfeld, particularly against Saphir. In his zeal, however, to throw the gauntlet down to Saphir, he wrote an article called *Meine Ansicht* and concluded it with the following: "Erstens weiss Herr *Saphir*, wie ganz Deutschland es weiss, dass *Bauernfeld* Kein mittelmässiger, sondern ein sehr guter Schriftsteller ist. Dann—wollte man das Wort gut in einer so übertriebenen Steigerung gebrauchen, dass es mit fehlerlos zusammenfiele—auf welcher Stufe müsste derjenige selbst stehen, der über *Bauernfeld* das Mittelmässig aussprechen wollte? Nein, nein, Herr *Saphir* denkt nicht daran."⁸⁰

Grillparzer did not have long to wait for Saphir's response. His answer appeared very promptly in Bäuerle's *Theaterzeitung* and was in a more sarcastic tone than was even Saphir's wont. Mimicking the style of the Grillparzer article, he wrote: "Ich habe die obige Erklärung des so sehr geehrten Herrn *Grillparzer* nicht ohne Lächeln gelesen. Erstlich weil unser Landsmann Herr *Grillparzer*, den ich als Dichter so hoch schätze, den ich aber als Kritiker kennen zu lernen noch nicht Gelegenheit hatte, also weil Herr *Grillparzer* sehr wohl weiss, dass ich besser weiss und wissen muss, was Deutschland weiss, weil ich zehn Jahre in Deutschland—gelebt habe. Zweitens muss ich Herrn *Grillparzer* sehr höflich, aber auch sehr bestimmt für die Güte danken, dem Publicum zu sagen, was ich denke oder was ich nicht denke. Wer das Glück hat, selbst mit dem Publicum reden zu können, der soll nicht so schwach sein, sich von einem Andern—und wollte man auch den Andern noch so hoch stellen—vertreten zu lassen. Denn auf

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 375.

⁸⁰ W. III, 2, p. 135. Grillparzer's article appeared in Kaltenbaeck's *Blätter für Lit., Kunst u. Kritik* (Nr. 14). It was the same periodical (Nr. 7) that had published Bauernfeld's article.

welcher Stufe müsste derjenige stehen, der sich und seine Meinung nicht selbst vertritt und dann auch derjenige, der einem anderen Schriftsteller oder auch dem Publicum seine Ansicht aufdringen wollte?! Nein, nein, Herr *Grillparzer* denkt nicht daran."⁸¹

Strange as it may seem, Grillparzer, who resented the fact that Saphir called Bauernfeld mediocre, had made the following entry in his diary on September 16, 1832, two and one half years before the Saphir episode: "Der halb natürliche halb gemachte Leichtsinn dieses Menschen, den ich sehr geliebt habe, wird mir nach gerade widerlich. Ich betrachte ihn für verloren. Er könnte nur mit eigentlicher Applikation etwas werden. Sein ganzes Talent geht vom Gemüthe aus, *die dramatische Anlage ist ohnehin schwach*. Er muss an dieser Lumpenhaftigkeit zu Grunde gehen."⁸² Thus, himself considering Bauernfeld's dramatic talent weak, he antagonized the most vicious critic of his day because he shared his own opinion.

Saphir's answer to Grillparzer did not end the matter. A *Duplik* and a *Replik* were written and were suppressed by the censors, so that Saphir had the last word in the argument. This he never forgot, and he took advantage of it by making insinuating remarks in his paper.⁸³ As if to make Saphir's triumph complete, Bauernfeld's *Fortunat* was produced one month after he had called Bauernfeld a mediocre writer. It was such a dismal failure that Bauernfeld had to flee the booing and hissing of the audience. Grillparzer was the only one who applauded and looked contemptuously at the laughing people about him.⁸⁴ Thus Bauernfeld himself supplied Saphir with the justification for the use of the adjective mediocre, and Saphir took full advantage of this by mocking Bauernfeld for his failure.⁸⁵

Whereas Grillparzer remained aloof and refused to give Saphir the satisfaction of taking his critical jibes seriously, Bauernfeld found a way of revenging himself. In the same year he wrote the comedy *Bürgerlich und Romantisch* and inserted in it a character, Lohnlakai Unruh, who was a thinly disguised caricature of Saphir.

⁸¹ W. III, 2, p. 136.

⁸² Bauernfeld, *Erinnerungen*, p. 383.

⁸⁵ Bauernfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

⁸² *Ibid.*, II, 9, p. 78. Author's italics.

⁸⁴ Costenoble, *op. cit.*, II, p. 221.

After a successful staging of this comedy, Saphir gave it a fairly favorable criticism adding, concerning his theatrical image, "Der Unruh ist früher Recensent gewesen und dann Lohnlakai geworden. Da er oft schlechte Stücke recensiren musste, zog er es zu seinem Vergnügen vor, Lohnlakai zu werden. Der Lohnlakai klopft grobes und feines Tuch aus, der Recensent gewöhnlich nur grobes. Im dritten Akt schwindet der bürgerliche Recensent-Lakai aus dem Stück—wieder ein Vorteil, Andere müssen fünf Akte anhören. . . ."⁸⁶ Thus even here, Saphir managed by his wit and self-assurance, to turn the tables so that he again had the laugh on his opponent.

While Grillparzer never gave nor took any quarter from Saphir, whom he despised thoroughly, Bauernfeld made a truce with him which lasted for a while. In his memoirs Bauernfeld relates how he met Saphir one day after the March Revolution. This was the first time that they came face to face, and Bauernfeld stepped up to him in the street and offered him the olive branch, saying that in the days of the new freedom, all animosities ought to end. Saphir shook hands with him and showed his friendliness after that in all his criticisms of Bauernfeld's works. When, however, he interpreted a satirical passage in his *Buch von den Wienern* as referring to him (this Bauernfeld denied) he again attacked Bauernfeld in print. The latter, however, felt that Saphir was not really bad, but rather frivolous and lacking in character.⁸⁷ This, oddly enough, was exactly what Grillparzer thought of Bauernfeld, who showed it by making peace with Saphir where Grillparzer remained adamant, thus illustrating again the irony of the entire situation.

Only once did Grillparzer have the opportunity to humiliate Saphir. That was when the latter wanted to join the Concordia. He knew that membership in this organization would enhance his prestige immensely, and would give him access to select literary circles. When the actor, Karl Schwarz, announced that he was going to bring Saphir to the next meeting of Concordia, the members greeted the announcement with silence. When he brought him

⁸⁶ Stern, *Bauernfeld, ein Dichterporträt*, pp. 55f.

⁸⁷ Bauernfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

on the following evening in spite of that, he found, to his amazement, that nobody was there. The two of them, Schwarz and Saphir, sat alone until midnight and finally went home. This insult was instigated by Grillparzer, and Saphir never forgot it. "Saphir rächte diese ihm zugefügte Beleidigung—es waren ihm deren noch mehrere zugefügt worden—durch die herbsten Angriffe," writes Frankl.⁸⁸

Saphir's real opportunity to revenge himself on Grillparzer for the Bauernfeld incident came in 1838 with the production of *Weh dem, der lügt*. This does not mean that he was friendly at any other time toward Grillparzer's works. When *Der Traum ein Leben* was produced four years before, Saphir criticized it adversely. Caroline Pichler tells in her book of the unfavorable reception of this drama, blaming it all on Saphir, who came to the theatre with a group of his friends and deliberately drowned out the applause of Grillparzer's admirers. "Kurz das Stück ward richtig 'ermordet,' " she states.⁸⁹ By the time *Weh dem, der lügt* was staged, the feud between Grillparzer and Saphir had been aggravated by the Bauernfeld incident, so that Saphir gave full vent to his antagonism. He resorted to low satire and invective in his review of the comedy. The following motto was at the head of the article which he wrote:

„Weh' dem, der lügt“, Lustspiel.

„Weh' dem, der die Wahrheit sagt“, Trauerspiel.

„Wohl dem, der schweigen kann“, Pantomime.⁹⁰

It was due largely to the poor reception of *Weh dem, der lügt*, in which Saphir had played such a large part, that Grillparzer made his momentous decision never again to write for the public. How well he kept that vow is common knowledge. Thus Saphir played an important, even though deleterious, rôle in Grillparzer's career. One might well speculate on the effects which a more objective and conciliatory attitude on Saphir's part might have had on Grillparzer and his fate as a dramatist. He might, perhaps, have been spared the bitterness and disappointment which dictated to him the need to write for himself alone and to disregard the public entirely.

⁸⁸ *Zur Biographie Grillparzers*, p. 8.

⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 304.

⁹⁰ Fäulhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

Some of Grillparzer's most pointed and brilliant epigrams were written about Saphir. Although they were meant largely as an emotional outlet for Grillparzer, they were on the lips of most of his friends and acquaintances, thus serving to avenge Grillparzer to some extent.⁹¹ Most of these epigrams were written in 1835 or 1838. The reason for these dates should be obvious. In 1835 he wrote:

„Schon einst Voltaire war auf der Spur
Der Frerons und Saphire,
Er meint: un sot trouve toujours
Un plus sot qui l'admire,"⁹²

When Grillparzer was particularly acrimonious after the failure of his comedy, he wrote the following vehement epigram, undoubtedly with Saphir in mind:

„Der Teufel wollte einen Mörder schaffen,
Und nahm dazu den Stoff von manchem Tiere:
Wolf, Fuchs und Schakal gaben her das Ihre;
Nur eins vergass der Ehrenmann: den Mut.
Da drückt' er ihm die Nase ein voll Wut
Und rief: Lump, werd' ein Jud' und recensiere!"⁹³

Grillparzer's contacts with the Jewish journalists were not all unpleasant. His association with Witthauer, the editor of the *Modezeitung* was decidedly a friendly one. Witthauer was a close friend of Bauernfeld through whom he came into frequent contact with Grillparzer. After the fiasco of *Der Fortunat*, Grillparzer and Witthauer tried, among other things, to improve this play by shortening it.⁹⁴ They were also present at Bauernfeld's celebration of his successful production of *Bürgerlich und Romantisch* which contained the Saphir caricature.⁹⁵ In addition to visiting one another, Grillparzer and Witthauer also met at the Wertheimer home where they were both frequent guests. In 1838 Witthauer published an album for the benefit of the flood victims of Pest, and

⁹¹ For further details on the feud between Saphir, Grillparzer and Bauernfeld cf. Sauer, "Bauernfeld und Saphir, die Anfänge ihrer literarischen Fehde," *Beiträge zur Lit.- u. Theatergeschichte*, Berlin-Steglitz, 1918; also Sauer, "Bauernfeld und Saphir," *Jhb.* XXVII, pp. 36ff.

⁹² W. 1893 ed., III, p. 107.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 123, cf. also pp. 107 and 120 for further epigrams.

⁹⁴ Costenoble, *op. cit.*, II, p. 221.

⁹⁵ Bauernfeld, *Tagebücher*, p. 74.

Grillparzer contributed a scene from his fragment *Hannibal*.⁹⁶ With his death in 1846, Witthauer's friendship with Grillparzer came to an untimely termination.⁹⁷

In his diary of 1847 Grillparzer wrote at length about Sigmund Engländer, who enjoyed some prominence as the publisher of *Der Salon*. Engländer, a young man of twenty-four at the time, was heralded by Saphir, who obtained his services for his *Humorist*, as the only man with sufficient ability to "ennoble the dull journalism of Vienna." This elicited the Grillparzer comment on Engländer, whom he considered devoid of talent and incapable of recognizing it in others. He also felt that Engländer's style was unoriginal, even though the Vienna public regarded it as a literary innovation. He was, however, not stupid, according to Grillparzer, and occasionally he even made a correct observation, but a clever cook could have made it also.⁹⁸ In one of his articles in the *Humorist* Engländer criticized Grillparzer's and Stifter's contributions to the *Iris* of 1848. There is no indication of any actual contact between Grillparzer and Engländer. The fact that the latter was an associate of Saphir would preclude, to some extent, any such possibility.

On his numerous travels Grillparzer met many men and women of Jewish extraction, but none elicited a more favorable comment or made a stronger impression on him than Rahel Varnhagen. He met her in 1826 during his first trip to Germany, under conditions which would normally have caused him to be impervious to any strong impression. He was extremely fatigued and anxious to be alone, but when Rahel began to talk, he was spellbound. His reaction to her words is indeed worth quoting. "Nun fing aber die alternde, vielleicht nie hübsche, von Krankheit zusammengekrümmte, etwas einer Fee, um nicht zu sagen einer Hexe, ähnliche Frau zu sprechen an, und ich war bezaubert. Meine Müdigkeit verflog, oder machte vielmehr einer Art Trunkenheit Platz. Sie sprach und sprach bis gegen Mitternacht, und ich weiss nicht mehr,

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁹⁷ Friedrich Witthauer was born in 1793 in Bremen and died in Meran in 1846. For an evaluation of his critical ability see Dingelstedt, "Die Poesie in Oesterreich," *Jhb.* IX, p. 318.

⁹⁸ W. II, 11, p. 139.

haben sie mich fortgetrieben, oder ging ich von selbst fort. Ich habe nie in meinem Leben interessanter und besser reden gehört."⁹⁹ He regretted that he could not visit her again.¹⁰⁰ Coming from a man of Grillparzer's aloof and reticent temperament, these words are indeed a great tribute to Rahel. She was one of the few reasons for his reluctance to leave Berlin.

It is not surprising that she impressed Grillparzer so favorably, if one bears in mind that even Bartels considers her "eine geniale Erscheinung," adding, "man wird ihr nicht gerecht, wenn man sie nicht als genial auffasst."¹⁰¹ He says so, even though he admits that she had more of the Jewess in her than the other two women of the Romantic school, Henriette Herz and Dorothea Schlegel, the latter of whom became the intimate friend of Caroline Pichler in Vienna.

Regarding his first meeting with Rahel, Grillparzer told the Baroness von Gustedt that he was at first repelled by Rahel's ugliness and had no desire to continue the acquaintance. After he heard her talk he remained until two o'clock in the morning. "... Als ich zur Tür hinausging, griff ich bewegt in die Haare und rief: Auf der ganzen Welt hätte mich nur eine Frau glücklich machen können und das ist Rahel!" he is quoted as saying.¹⁰² To Bauernfeld, too, he once stated that Rahel was the only woman he would have liked to marry, and to Pollhammer he remarked that Rahel was "ungemein gescheit und anziehend."¹⁰³

When Grillparzer was in Germany in 1847 he visited Varnhagen von Ense who quoted him as follows in his diary: "Das Herz drängt mich zu Ihnen zu kommen, und zu niemanden sonst hier!" and then added: "Wie alt und vergrämt sieht er aus! Aber sein edler Charakter ist unerschüttert, seine Gesinnung rein, sein Gefühl warm und stark. Er schildert mir seine Verhältnisse, den Druck und die Einsamkeit, in denen er lebt. . . . Wir sprachen von Tauber, Karajan, Zedlitz, Landesmann (a Jewish critic writing under the *nom de plume* of Hieronymus Lorm), Auguste Brede, Henriette Pereira."¹⁰⁴ Just what was said about any of these peo-

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 16, p. 187.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Judentum und deutsche Literatur*, p. 7.

¹⁰² *Gesp.*, III, p. 305.

¹⁰³ Pollhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

¹⁰⁴ *Tagebücher*, IV, pp. 141f.

ple Varnhagen did not indicate. Since Grillparzer's diary was being neglected by him at that time, his notes on his trip to Germany are very fragmentary and contain no reference to the conversation at the Varnhagen home.

Perhaps no other incident in Grillparzer's life is so significant from the viewpoint of ascertaining his attitude toward the Jews, as his trip to Paris in 1836. During his entire stay of over a month, he associated almost exclusively with Jews. His diary and autobiography are replete with references to Heine, Börne, Meyerbeer, the Neuwalls and the Rothschilds. It is particularly significant that he chose to associate with Jews in a city like Paris which offered unlimited opportunities for other contacts. His association with them was, therefore, voluntary and a matter of preference. There is no doubt about his knowledge of the Jewish origin of his Paris friends because they were all too prominent in the literary, musical and financial worlds respectively for that fact to have remained secret. Yet, although he refers to them repeatedly in his diary and autobiography, he never once alludes to their racial origin. It was a matter of total indifference to him. He liked some of them very much and disliked others, but never because they were Jews.

Börne was one of the first people that Grillparzer looked up on his arrival in Paris. He was particularly anxious to meet him, since it was Börne who defended *Die Ahnfrau* when all the other critics hurled the hateful epithet "fate tragedy" at it. Not only did he champion the cause of the young dramatist whose first work became a bone of contention in critical circles, but he also took the critics to account for their confusion regarding this drama. On one occasion Börne cited excerpts from the various criticisms of *Die Ahnfrau* and then added: "Vorgehende, gegen diese Tragödie gerichtete, Bemerkungen sollten nur andeuten, welche Verwirrung in der Ansicht der dramatischen Kunst der Neuern herrsche, nicht den herrlichen und geistreichen Dichter sollten sie treffen. Gäbe es nur eine grössere Zahl solcher dramatischen Dichtungen, dass wir endlich der jämmerlichen Familiengeschichten ledig würden. . . ." ¹⁰⁵ That Börne's encouraging articles in *Die Wage*

¹⁰⁵ Ludwig Börne, *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, pp. 29f.

touched the confused and hurt author of *Die Ahnfrau* is to be expected, even though Grillparzer hid his feelings regarding the adverse criticisms behind a mask of indifference. Since he was so touched by Müllner's favorable opinion as to feel that the latter saved him the most precious thing in his life, his self-confidence, he could not have remained completely impervious to Börne's views. The fact that he went to see Börne right after his arrival in Paris, is proof that he was grateful to him.

On April 11, 1836 Grillparzer went to visit Börne, and not finding him home, he decided to present a letter from his friend Herz to his sister, Mme. Neuwall who lived in the same house as Börne.¹⁰⁶ He was received very cordially by the former Henriette Herz and her family. He found out from the Neuwalls that Börne was in the country at Auteuil. After inviting Grillparzer to lunch with them on the following Thursday, they promised to invite Börne also and thus give Grillparzer a chance to meet him.

In accordance with their promise, the Neuwalls brought Grillparzer and Börne together on Thursday, April 14, 1836. There were a number of other people present, mostly Jews, who kept the two of them from any serious discussion. Grillparzer wrote the following comment about Börne in his diary: "Den Witz sieht man dem Manne wohl an, kaum aber die Gewalt, am wenigsten die Ausgelassenheit. Ich hatte mich *herzlich* auf ihn gefreut."¹⁰⁷ He seems to have had a very pleasant time at the Neuwall home. He also wrote that he liked the son of the house, Emanuel Neuwall, quite well and that the dinner was good.¹⁰⁸ How well he liked young Neuwall is best shown by the fact that he went to the theatre and on sightseeing trips with him, rather than with anybody else.

Five days after his first meeting with Börne, Grillparzer visited him at Auteuil. Börne was alone at the time and was very glad to

¹⁰⁶ Adolf Herz, Grillparzer's friend, was a *Prokurist* for the Eskeles bank in Vienna. His sister, Henriette, married Markus, Ritter von Neuwall, a banker, whose real name was originally Leidesdorf. He settled in Vienna about the same time as the Biedermanns, and received the title, Edler v. Neuwall in 1817 and Ritter in 1825. The sons and daughters of the Neuwalls became converted and achieved great prominence in the social and political circles of Vienna. For further details see Mayer, *Die Wiener Juden*.

¹⁰⁷ W. II, 10, p. 17.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

see Grillparzer whose good will toward him is shown in his satisfaction that Börne lived in a well furnished home and had a servant. "Ich freue mich, dass er so viel hat um leben zu können, sonst würde es ihm bei allen diesen Zensur-Verbothen übel ergehen," he wrote in his diary.¹⁰⁹ They spent their time discussing politics with two men who dropped in. Although Grillparzer was invited to lunch, he pleaded another appointment. He was so in fear of the Austrian censors, he wrote in his diary, as to feel that having lunch with Börne alone would be cause for a "Gesandtschaftsbericht," and having it in the company of other German exiles would increase the seven deadly sins by one.¹¹⁰ His association with Börne was, therefore, definitely hampered by the fact that he was always surrounded by refugees in whose company Grillparzer was afraid to be seen.

On May 9 Börne came to see Grillparzer in Paris and invited him for the following day to Auteuil for breakfast. Although Grillparzer was very pressed for time, since he intended to leave for London within a few days, he could not refuse Börne, he wrote in his diary.¹¹¹ On the following morning he arrived one hour late and found Börne awaiting him on the balcony. He introduced him to the Strausses whose loyalty and devotion made his exile more bearable.¹¹² Regarding them Grillparzer wrote: "Eine liebenswürdige Frankfurterin mit ihrem wackern Manne. Sind aus Anhänglichkeit für Börne zu ihm nach Paris gezogen. Nun begreife ich, dass der Mann hier aushalten kann," and about his host he added: "Börne herzlich, gutartig."¹¹³

While Grillparzer was there, Börne told him that he had received a copy of Lenau's *Faust* with a request for an opinion. He could not help thinking of his own experiences with the critics, and so he wrote rather bitterly in his diary: "Armer Thor der ich war, als ich mir's mein ganzes Leben lang zu einer Gewissenssache machte, auch nicht mit einem Worte Kritiker und Journalisten

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 76. This couple stayed with Börne until his death a few months after Grillparzer's visit, on Feb. 12, 1837 and it was Frau Strauss who copied all his papers and MSS and arranged for the publication of his *Nachlass*.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

für mich zu stimmen."¹¹⁴ He may well have thought of Saphir whom he had antagonized needlessly over the volatile and mediocre Bauernfeld.

Although Börne was very cordial and invited him to stay for the evening and join him at a dinner given by refugees, Grillparzer declined because of his desire to avoid having his name linked with the exiles. The fact that he learned of a plan to cheer him at the dinner as a martyr to censorship, undoubtedly acted as a deterrent to his acceptance of the invitation. Thus, feeling a definite interest in Börne, whose sincerity of conviction and clear judgment he respected, Grillparzer, nevertheless, did not see as much of him as he would have liked to. "Von den Menschen in Paris waren mir die interessantesten zwei deutsche Landsleute, Börne und Heine. Mit Ersterem kam ich in ein fast freundschaftliches Verhältnis," he wrote.¹¹⁵ The fact that they did not become closer friends was, as we have seen, due to the constant presence of refugees in Börne's house. There is no doubt about Grillparzer's regard for Börne of whom he made the following analysis: "Börne war gewiss ein ehrlicher Mann, und das politisch Aufreizende in seinen Schriften, oder vielmehr das auf den höchsten Grad Gesteigerte derselben kam wahrscheinlich nur daher, dass er die Deutschen für so Dickhäutig hielt, dass man mit Prügeln dreinschlagen müsse, um nur die Spur eines geringen Eindrucks zurückzulassen."¹¹⁶ He also agreed with Börne on most matters which the two of them discussed, except on the subject of Goethe whom Börne criticized for his "Aristokratismus."¹¹⁷ How Grillparzer felt about Goethe is best indicated by his tears at the first sight of the great man of Weimar in 1826.

Grillparzer's association with Heine, the other of his "interesting German compatriots," was somewhat less satisfying. Although Heine made an excellent impression on Grillparzer in the beginning, he disappointed him at the end by his perfidious attitude toward others, among them Börne. Three years before they actually met, Heine regarded Grillparzer as his friend. In a letter of introduction for a young Frenchman named Marmier, who was

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 218f.

¹¹⁵ W. I, 16, p. 218.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

anxious to meet the outstanding representatives of literary Vienna, Heine wrote that he wanted him to know all his friends, adding: "Ich rechne Sie zu dieser Zahl; denn ich hege die beste Meinung von Ihnen. Ich habe Sie von jeher sehr gut verstehen und darum verehren können. Auch von Ihnen hoffe ich nicht ganz ungekannt zu sein. Der junge Franzose soll Sie und die höchsten Eichen des deutschen Vaterlandes herzlich grüssen."¹¹⁸

Due to the fact that Grillparzer's autobiography and his diary frequently overlap, we have a double account of his association with Heine. Grillparzer met him for the first time on April 27, 1836, one week after his acquaintance with Börne. Regarding this, we read in his diary that Heine was very pleased to receive a visit from him. Apparently it was an unexpected visit because Heine mistook him for somebody else at first. He was also not dressed and the house was in disorder. Grillparzer wrote quite a lengthy comment on the "tolle Wirtschaft" of the Heine menage and concluded with the observation that he liked Heine in spite of it. "—mir ist der Leichtsinn nur da zuwider, wo er die Ausübung dessen was man soll, hindert," he added.¹¹⁹

During their first meeting the two of them discussed literature and found themselves in accord in their likes and dislikes to such an extent that Grillparzer rejoiced in the rare pleasure of having found a German man of letters with such sound common sense.¹²⁰ Heine's attitude toward the Romantic school pleased him especially. In his autobiography Grillparzer gave the following account of his first meeting with Heine: "Bei Nennung meines Namens zeigte er grosse Freude und sagte mir viel Schmeichelhaftes, das er wahrscheinlich in der nächsten Stunde vergessen hat. In der gegenwärtigen Stunde unterhielten wir uns vortrefflich. Ich habe kaum je einen deutschen Literator verständiger reden gehört."¹²¹ He also pointed out that Heine and Börne had a great respect for German literature and ranked it above all others, despite their disapproval of certain of its phases.¹²² When Grillparzer finally left, he was in a better mood than he had been for some time. "Der Besuch hat mich heiter gestimmt," he wrote.¹²³

¹¹⁸ W. III, 2, p. 92.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 10, p. 45.

¹²¹ W., I, 16, p. 220.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, II, 10, p. 45.

Grillparzer apparently brought up the subject of Börne in his conversation with Heine because Heine complained to Grillparzer that Börne was posing as a friend of his without justification. Heine stated that he was never a friend of Börne and spoke with contempt of the German refugees as a whole.¹²⁴ Judging by Grillparzer's terse comment, "Mit Börne steht er schlecht," Heine must have said a great deal more about and against Börne.¹²⁵ Since discretion was not part of his make-up, he undoubtedly maligned Börne quite a bit, goaded on by Grillparzer's friendly attitude toward Börne. In his book on Börne, which appeared in the summer of 1840 and caused a literary furor by its vehement attack on the dead Börne, Heine accused him of jealousy and resentment over the fact that he had ignored him. He also stated that he deliberately feigned indifference toward politics and other matters which Börne considered grave, just to annoy him. In reading Heine's remarks about Börne, one is struck by the fact that he tried hard to rationalize his dislike for Börne. After making many derogatory statements about the latter, Heine felt that he was being very objective in his analysis of Börne, stating in part, ". . . ich bin mir wenigstens der kältesten Unparteilichkeit bewusst."¹²⁶ As if to prove this, he pointed out that Börne was a great patriot and that he resembled Lessing in some respects. "Aber diese Verwandtschaft beruht nur auf der inneren Tüchtigkeit, dem edlen Willen, der patriotischen Passion und dem Enthusiasmus für Humanität. Auch die Verstandesrichtung war in beiden dieselbe,"¹²⁷ he added. These were the very traits which Grillparzer must have admired in Börne and which were also part of his own personality. It is interesting to note that Grillparzer had compared Schreyvogel, whom he admired greatly, with Lessing.

Börne, who was much more discreet and tactful than Heine, said nothing to Grillparzer about his dislike for Heine which was based on many more valid reasons. In giving his impression of Heine, Börne mentioned specifically certain phases of his character which also struck Grillparzer on his subsequent meeting with Heine. Thus, in a letter to Frau Strauss on Sept. 27, 1831, Börne

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*¹²⁵ *Ibid.*¹²⁶ Heine, *Sämtliche Werke*, Elster ed. VII, p. 107, cf. also pp. 90, 104, 106.¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 107, cf. also p. 118.

wrote concerning Heine: "Heine gefällt mir nicht. . . . Ich und meinesgleichen, wir affektieren oft den Scherz, wenn wir sehr ernst sind; aber Heines Ernst scheint mir immer affektiert. Es ist ihm nichts heilig, an der Wahrheit liebt er nur das Schöne, er hat keinen Glauben."¹²⁸ Three days later, after another visit to Heine, he wrote that his first impression had become intensified, that Heine was heartless and that his conversation even dull. His spirit was in his fingertips, he added.¹²⁹

Börne also made a very correct appraisal of Heine's unscrupulous wit which so antagonized Grillparzer. "Sein Spott ist sehr bössartig, und man muss sich sehr vor ihm hüten, dass man in seiner Gegenwart von keinem etwas erzählt, was er brauchen kann," Börne stated.¹³⁰ He also pointed out that Heine was always trying to say something startling and would remain silent, rather than make an ordinary remark, adding "Besonders ärgert mich an ihm seine Sucht immer Lachen zu erregen."¹³¹ This was not infrequently at Börne's expense, whom Heine liked to tease over his concern with political conditions in Germany. Börne's analysis was, as a whole, correct, and was borne out later by Heine's behavior at the Rothschild dinner which turned Grillparzer from him.

On April 25, 1836, Grillparzer presented his letter of introduction to the Rothschilds. He was received very warmly by Frau von Rothschild who impressed him as a charming and cultured woman, as well as a good conversationalist.¹³² A short time after that, he had dinner there with Heine and the Neuwall family. Regarding Heine's presence there, he wrote in his diary: "Heine ist da, unwohl, leidend. Man fetiirt ihn sehr, ne noceat, wie man sagt. . . .

¹²⁸ Heine, *Gespräche*, Bieber ed., p. 127.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

¹³⁰ Heine, *Gesp.*, p. 120. An excellent illustration of this characteristic is seen in the following incident. When Heine was in London, he was a frequent and, often, uninvited guest in the home of the pianist Moscheles. Knowing Heine's reputation for avenging himself in print, Frau Moscheles was particularly generous toward him and requested him to refrain from mentioning her husband's name in his book about London. She explained her odd request to him thus: "Moscheles Fach ist die Musik, für die haben Sie doch kein besonderes Verständnis. Hingegen könnten Sie leicht irgendeinen Stoff für Ihre geniale Satire an ihm finden und ausbeuten; das möchte ich nicht." (Heine, *Gesp.*, p. 83.) Heine did not mention Moscheles in his book.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹³² W. II, 10, p. 40.

Heine war nicht sehr angenehm und gieng bald."¹³³ Grillparzer's autobiography, however, contains a much more detailed account of Heine. "So sehr mir Heine im Gespräch unter vier Augen gefiel, eben so sehr missfiel er mir, als wir ein paar Tage später bei Rothschild zu Mittag waren. Man sah wohl dass die Hauswirte Heinen fürchteten, und diese Furcht missbrauchte er um sich bei jeder Gelegenheit verdeckt über sie lustig zu machen. Man muss aber bei Niemand essen, dem man nicht wohlwill, und wenn man Jemand verächtlich findet muss man bei ihm nicht essen. Es setzte sich daher auch von da an unser Verhältnis nicht fort."¹³⁴ This observation of Grillparzer's is in complete harmony with the one made by Börne. Heine had to be witty at all costs regardless of the feelings of his host and hostess. When he was alone with Grillparzer he was serious and sincere, thus impressing him favorably. In company he had to maintain his reputation as a wit. That the Rothschilds feared him is very likely, since they were no more proof against his biting satire than were Börne, Moscheles or his own uncle, over whom he held his satirical pen suspended like a sword of Damocles.

It is easy to accept Grillparzer's reason for not seeing Heine any more after that dinner. Heine's pathetic attempt at humor at the expense of his hosts must have been very revolting to a man of Grillparzer's sincerity. He must have seen Heine at his worst then, because he was neither well nor very pleasant. The fact that he left early indicates that his efforts at wit were not very successful and that he, too, did not enjoy himself.

Gustav Karpeles tries hard in his book on Heine to justify his behavior at the Rothschild dinner. He claims that Grillparzer did Heine an injustice in stating that the Rothschilds feared him. This is one relationship, he claims, on which no shadow of opprobrium can possibly fall, since Heine respected the Rothschilds and they had no reason at all to fear his wit.¹³⁵ (*sic!*) As proof par excellence of Grillparzer's misunderstanding of Heine's actions at the Rothschild home, he states: "Den psychologischen Widerspruch zwischen den beiden Versionen Grillparzers über jenes Diner bei

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹³⁴ W. I, 16, pp. 220f.

¹³⁵ *Heine und seine Zeitgenossen*, pp. 84f.

Rothschild haben die Leser wohl selbst herausgefunden. Das eine Mal heisst es: 'Man sekirt ihn sehr,' das zweitemal: er habe 'sich über die Andern lustig gemacht.' Entweder schliesst eines das Andere aus oder Heine hat jene gesellschaftliche Revanche geübt, die jeder Andere in gleicher Lage sich auch nicht hätte entgehen lassen."¹³⁶ To rob this defense of its merit, one needs only to point out that Grillparzer did not write *sekirt* but *fetiirt*.¹³⁷ An additional argument for the correctness of Grillparzer's reaction, is the fact that Heine's actions were very much in keeping with his general character and reputation for that sort of thing. There is no contradiction in the two Grillparzer versions of the dinner.

Grillparzer who, as we have seen, became alienated from Heine by the latter's tactless behavior, spoke about him to a number of people. Laube, a friend of both, gave Grillparzer's opinion of Heine as follows: "Er hat ihn literarisch hochgeschätzt, moralisch übel angesehen."¹³⁸ Concerning Heine's opinion of Grillparzer, Laube claimed that Heine had a great deal of respect for Grillparzer and often execrated the Austrian censorship which enslaved talents such as his.¹³⁹ To Pollhammer Grillparzer said that he had never heard another German speak as brilliantly and pleasantly as Heine. He also told him that after seeing Heine twice, he was frightened away by his perfidious nature which made him revile a person as soon as he walked out of his house.¹⁴⁰ This version is perfectly in accord with the entries which Grillparzer had made in his diary and autobiography many years before.

In 1855 Grillparzer wrote an epigram about Heine which is consistent with his general opinion of his character. The epigram was written for Dessauer and reads thus:

„Seiner Laune giftig und wild
Lässt Herr Heine getrost den Zügel:
Sein Krankenbett ist ein starker Schild,
Der seinen Rücken schützt gegen Prügel.“¹⁴¹

Shortly after Heine's death one year later, Grillparzer wrote a lengthy analysis of him which shows a keen understanding of his

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

¹³⁸ Karpeles, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

¹⁴⁰ Pollhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹³⁷ W. II, 10, p. 70.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ W. 1893 ed. III, p. 195.

genius and his personality. He considered Heine very talented and endowed with a great deal of common sense, which, he felt, was a rare phenomenon among contemporary German writers. He regarded his talent as essentially satirical and believed that he had written some really fine poems in his youth, when he was still capable of sincere emotions and was under the influence of Goethe. At the end of his dissolute life and confined to bed he again began to express real emotions in his poetry. With the long years of his hopeless illness "kam eine abgenöthigte Einkehr in sich selbst, eine Erinnerung an die Jugendgefühle, vielleicht ein Wunsch die eigene Nichtswürdigkeit vor sich selbst zu verbergen, über ihn, daher man auch von seinen Versen nur die ersten (in den Reisebildern) und einige seiner letzten als Gedichte ansprechen kann."¹⁴²

In addition to Börne and Heine, Grillparzer associated during his Paris stay with another very prominent personality, the Jewish composer Giacomo Meyerbeer. In a letter to Kathi Fröhlich, written shortly after his arrival, he mentioned the fact that he lived in the same hotel with Thalberg and Meyerbeer.¹⁴³ Two days later Meyerbeer visited him. Grillparzer wrote in his diary after that visit that he was "Ein wackerer Mann mit Künstlerausagen; nicht aufgeblasen durch seine neuesten Erfolge."¹⁴⁴ He was eager to continue his association with Meyerbeer and went on two occasions to his suite only to find him out. Grillparzer complained in his diary four days after their first meeting that Meyerbeer did not come to see him again, even though he seemed favorably impressed. After a few days Meyerbeer brought him a ticket for the performance of his opera *Die Hugenotten*.¹⁴⁵ He attended the opera and was pleased with the good seat which the composer had given him. He was not so sure about his reaction to *Die Hugenotten* and felt that he ought to see another performance before judging it.¹⁴⁶ Two days later, on Sunday, April 24, 1836, Grillparzer had dinner with Meyerbeer and his mother. He was somewhat annoyed by Meyerbeer's intimation that he should have paid his respects to his mother before this and was very distracted during the course

¹⁴² W. II, 11, p. 260.

¹⁴⁴ W. II, 10, p. 13.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, III, 2, p. 150.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 33.

of the dinner. His state of mind was such that he did not know what he was saying and wondered what Meyerbeer thought when he heard words from the mouth of a dead man.¹⁴⁷ Grillparzer was wishing at the time that he were back in Vienna. The strain of having to meet people and having to make conversation when he preferred to be alone and silent, was making itself felt more and more.

During the years following his trip to France, Grillparzer met Meyerbeer on numerous occasions. In 1846 Concordia gave a party in Meyerbeer's honor. Grillparzer also saw him at the Bacher home and at his own home. When Grillparzer was in Germany in 1847, he was cordially invited by Meyerbeer, both in person and by letter, to come to dinner.¹⁴⁸ Since Grillparzer did not keep any diary at that time, the only source of information is the diary of his companion Wilhelm Bogner, the twenty-year-old nephew of Kathi Fröhlich. This diary, which Sauer calls "Auslassungen eines echten Wiener Lausbuben" and which will have to serve us in connection with all Grillparzer contacts during that time, is so anti-Semitic in tone as to furnish an excellent contrast with Grillparzer's own diary.¹⁴⁹ Whereas Bogner rarely ever overlooks the fact that a given person is Jewish, Grillparzer never once mentions it. Concerning Meyerbeer, Bogner was very discreet in his diary comments, merely stating that Grillparzer met Alexander Humboldt and the well-known Jewish actress Henrietta Sonntag there, and that he, Bogner, almost fell asleep during the table d'hôte.¹⁵⁰ Whether Grillparzer had an enjoyable time is not known. The fact that Bogner was bored proves nothing beyond establishing his own mental inferiority and his incapacity to join in the conversation. Grillparzer continued to esteem Meyerbeer as a great artist and fine personality. In a poem written in 1850 he hailed him as a master who aimed high and achieved what he set out to do.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁸ W. III, 3, p. 10. At the Concordia reception given to Meyerbeer after a performance of *Vielka*, he, as the guest of honor, sat between Grillparzer and Gyrowetz. (*Gesp.*, VI, p. 391.)

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 11, p. 1x.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 16of.

¹⁵¹ W. 1893 ed. III, p. 29.

Grillparzer spent most of his time during his Paris stay with the Neuwall family. If we are to take his own statement regarding Heine and the Rothschilds, about not eating in the house of people one does not respect and wish well, we must come to the conclusion that he had the greatest respect for the Neuwalls. He had dinner or lunch with them almost daily. It was understood that he was to eat there, so that when Meyerbeer invited Grillparzer to dinner he had to go to the Neuwalls to excuse himself for not being able to come to their house for lunch on that Sunday.¹⁵²

Grillparzer liked Many Neuwall as soon as he met him. It took him two more visits before he wrote in his diary: "Die Familie gefällt mir sehr wohl."¹⁵³ While suspicious of all his compatriots in Paris, he trusted the Neuwalls implicitly. "Mir ist als witterte ich etwas Uriasartiges bei meinen hiesigen Landsleuten, mit Ausnahme der Familie Neuwall."¹⁵⁴ This was undoubtedly one of the reasons for his many visits to them. He generally found interesting people there. After his first meeting with Heine which had put him in such good humor, Grillparzer went to the Neuwalls and surprised them all by being "erträglich."¹⁵⁵

In spite of the many interesting contacts he had made in Paris, Grillparzer was blaming his many social activities for his lack of peace and solitude. He was also aware of a need to be more by himself. After three weeks in Paris he resolved to make fewer social contacts in London, his next stop, so that he would not have to be with people when he did not want to. He felt that the hospitality of the Neuwalls was making it difficult to live as he wished. "So lieb und gut die Neuwalls sind, so hat mir ihr Haus doch den hiesigen Aufenthalt verleidet. Ich verliere alle Haltung und Richtung, wenn ich üble Stimmungen nicht mit mir allein abmachen kann, sondern mich Andern gegenüber zwingen muss," he wrote.¹⁵⁶ He was most annoyed by the fact that he very rarely succeeded in hiding his dark moods for any length of time. Two days after writing the above he was again in the Neuwall home. This time his diary entry was: "Die Leute meinen es gut und ich finde sie

¹⁵² W. II, 10, p. 36.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

liebenswürdig, aber meine Freiheit wäre mir unendlichemale lieber. . . . War mit den 3 Neuwalls allein zu Tische. Unterhielten uns recht gut."¹⁵⁷ He continued seeing the Neuwalls regularly until the last day of his stay in Paris. On May 15, 1836 he left for London after a final round of Paris with Many Neuwall.¹⁵⁸

The inconsistency which is characteristic of Grillparzer's personality is, perhaps, nowhere so clearly discernible as in his association with the Neuwall family. He went there almost daily and usually enjoyed himself, yet he felt that he should have liked to stay away, only to go there again. He wanted solitude, yet he continued to visit them almost daily. He resolved to keep more to himself in London and to avoid all social entanglements, yet no sooner did he arrive there than he formed a similar contact with another Jewish family, the Figdors.

That Grillparzer was deeply touched by the friendship and hospitality of the Neuwalls is obvious from all his references to them. In a letter to his friend Karajan he wrote that he had deliberately refrained from presenting his letters of introduction to various people in Paris until half his stay was over, except for Herz's sister (Mme. Neuwall). This was actually a fact. It is interesting to note though, that, while he did not go to see the Rothschilds until April 24, and did not meet Heine until April 27, he went to Börne's house on April 11. This was the day on which he met the Neuwalls, after not finding Börne home. Grillparzer asked Karajan to deliver a message to Herz for him. "Sehen Sie Herz, so danken Sie ihm gefälligst in meinem Namen jetzt schon für die herzliche Aufnahme die ich im Hause seiner liebenswürdigen Schwester gefunden. Man hat mich dort so mit Gefälligkeiten überhäuft, dass die Beschämung darüber geradezu ein Hindernis war, so vieler Güte sich völlig zu erfreuen."¹⁵⁹ There is no reason for doubting the sincerity of the above message through which he intended to convey his gratitude and appreciation for the generous hospitality of the Neuwalls. In his London diary too, he wrote that the hospitality of this family became oppressive after a while by its very

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹⁵⁹ W. III, 2, p. 152.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

generosity. He also stated that money worries and poor health spoiled his enjoyment of his Paris stay.¹⁶⁰ These two reasons account for his depressed spirits while in Paris and for his annoyance at having to seem cheerful and pleasant in company.

Grillparzer's contact with the Paris Rothschilds was not based on any interest in them. After presenting his letter of introduction at the last moment compatible with social usage, he was invited to that fateful dinner at which Heine and the Neuwalls were present. Although he had found Frau Rothschild very charming the first time, he did not like her quite as much upon their second meeting. He still considered her a goddess compared to her husband, whom he considered common in appearance and manner.¹⁶¹ The letter of introduction which they gave him to the London branch of the Rothschild family, he resolved not to use, partly because he wanted to be more alone while in London and partly because he was not interested in the representatives of financial power.

Thus as we have seen, the people he associated with most frequently during his stay in Paris were all Jews. He did meet some others, but he did not see much of them. The fact that he came in such frequent contact with these Jews in Paris and that he was, on the whole, very favorably impressed with them, is very significant. His disappointment in Heine's character or his feeling that Rothschild was common are no indication of any antagonism toward the Jews. Börne said a great deal more against Heine without running the risk of being accused of racial bias. What Grillparzer said about Heine's lack of tact and sincerity was very mild when one considers that Heine provoked stronger comments from Jews. Grillparzer's friendship for the Neuwalls, Börne, and Meyerbeer is, on the other hand, definite proof of his freedom from any prejudice which would tend to condition his attitude toward Jews.

Despite Grillparzer's resolution to benefit by his Paris experiences, and avoid making social contacts, he soon found a very capable substitute for Many Neuwall in Gustav Figdor, a merchant, who represented the London branch of his father's exten-

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 10, p. 78

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

sive wool business.¹⁶² It was young Figdor who acted as his host and guide in London. Just as Grillparzer had wearied of the kindness of the Neuwalls, so he wished here at the end that Figdor had not been so friendly toward him and had left him more to himself. Although Figdor lived alone in London he was just then being visited by his father and his sister Fanny, both of whom Grillparzer met. How he felt about them is best seen in the following passage: "Zufällig fand sich eben Figdors Vater und seine höchst liebenswürdige Schwester zum Besuch bei dem jungen Manne, in deren Gesellschaft ich mich wie zu Hause fühlte."¹⁶³ He also liked young Figdor and appreciated his efforts to show him London.¹⁶⁴

Grillparzer visited the Bourse, St. Paul's Cathedral, Windsor, and many other places of interest in the company of Figdor. Through him he also met many prominent people and became acquainted with the lighter side of English life.¹⁶⁵ Figdor took his duties as guide so seriously that he even reserved a place for him on the boat to Antwerp. Toward the end of his stay in London Grillparzer became restless, as was his wont. In his diary he wrote: "Gieng zu Figdor, der in seiner Gutmüthigkeit sich für verpflichtet hält, mir die letzten Tage meines hiesigen Aufenthaltes noch die Hon(n)eurs der Stadt zu machen. Und ich gehe fleissig zu ihm, obschon mirs wahrhaftig lieber wäre, meine Zeit allein zu benützen. Gerade so wars in Paris mit Brandt."¹⁶⁶ It is noteworthy that he did not draw the analogy with the Neuwalls, but rather with Brandt, who had annoyed him so much toward the end of his Paris stay, that he could hardly restrain himself from insulting him.¹⁶⁷

There is no doubt that Grillparzer appreciated Figdor's hospitality just as much as he did that of the Neuwalls. His restlessness and his desire for solitude were part of his dualistic nature, just as it was part of his inconsistency to visit people and then com-

¹⁶² Jakob Figdor settled in Vienna in 1793 and received his *Toleranz* not, as was customary, from the *Landesregierung*, but directly from the Emperor. His son founded the wool business which soon became one of the biggest in Vienna with a large export trade and a branch office in London.

¹⁶³ W. I, 16, p. 224.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 111ff.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 79. Brandt was an Englishman who was Grillparzer's companion in Paris and from whom he took English lessons preparatory to his trip to London.

plain that he would rather be alone. It was characteristic of him to want that which he could not have at the moment; thus when he was alone he was lonely; and when he was with people he was unhappy and wanted to be alone. Before his departure from London he wrote an epigram to Gustav Figdor which indicates his attitude toward him.

Für einen jungen Kaufmann
(London, am 16. Juni 1836)

„Ein Kaufmann bin ich auch, ich selbst bin meine Ware;
Doch schenk' ich nicht davon, ich trachte nach Gewinn.
Wer Herz um Herzen tauscht, dem folg ich bis zur Bahre:
Du hast den Preis bezahlt, so nimm mich hin.“¹⁶⁸

When Grillparzer returned to Vienna he continued his friendly relationship with the Figdor family. On March 21, 1837, Fanny Figdor, whom he had met in London and found charming, invited him to attend a birthday party in her father's honor. She referred to Grillparzer as one of the few friends of her father, which indicates a cordial association between them.¹⁶⁹

While in Pest in the summer of 1843, Grillparzer was shown the sights of the city by the brother of one of his Jewish friends in Vienna, Sztankovits. He dined with the family in the course of his very brief stay in that city.¹⁷⁰

Grillparzer also had some contact with Dessauer, Helene Bacher, Levi, Löwenthal, Bornstein, and Bertha Semler.¹⁷¹ There is very little information about some of these contacts. From the diary of Wilhelm Bogner, we know that Grillparzer saw quite a good deal of the composer Josef Dessauer in 1847. He met Dessauer in Ischl after not having seen him for some time, and was immediately invited to his quarters where he played excerpts from

¹⁶⁸ W. 1803 ed., III, p. 40.

¹⁶⁹ W. III, 2, p. 183.

¹⁷⁰ *Gesp.*, VI, pp. 258f.

¹⁷¹ Josef Dessauer (1708-1876) came from a rich Jewish family of Prague.

Helene Bacher was the daughter of Samuel Bacher, a wholesale merchant, in whose house Bauernfeld and many other prominent people of the day were frequent guests. She helped her husband, F. Prantner (pseud. Leo Wolfram), with his literary work, possessing a great deal of ability and literary knowledge.

Simon Levi was a member of the Baumannshöhle and friend of many writers.

Max, Ritter von Löwenthal was a wealthy merchant.

Bertha Semler was the daughter of Moritz Semler, a member of Ludlam and a merchant.

his unfinished opera for Grillparzer. Bogner's diary contains the following passage: "Er hat ein merkwürdig gutes musikalisches Gedächtnis und ist nach Aussage Grillparzers ein recht verständiger gebildeter Mann; *aber doch ein Jude!*"¹⁷² Whereas Grillparzer undoubtedly considered Dessauer sensible and well educated, he did not care at all about his race or religion. The gratuitous comment about Dessauer being a Jew is, without a doubt, Bogner's own, whose antagonism toward the Jews is discernible in all his comments about them. No sooner had Grillparzer and Bogner reached the inn at Ischl, when Bogner saw a Jew he knew and came, as he states in his diary, "auf die leider nur zu wahre Vermuthung, dass daselbst zahlreiche Juden sich befinden die Grillparzer und somit auch meine Wenigkeit in Anspruch nehmen könnten."¹⁷³ The above deduction on Bogner's part shows that the Jews were expected to be cordial to Grillparzer and he to them. Bogner's fears about having to mingle with Jews were justified on the following morning, when Dessauer brought Grillparzer an invitation to dinner at the Wertheimstein home. Bogner was, of course, invited too. After dinner Dessauer and Madam Wertheimstein played a Mozart requiem which did not please the critical taste of young Bogner. "Et puis, nachdem wir den Mund gewischt und uns innerlich über Wertheimsteins Mozart-Verhutzung geärgert, gingen wir nach Hause um die Reisekleider anzulegen und dann wieder zu Wertheimstein zu gehen die sich erboten, uns per Wagen nach dem wegen seiner herrlichen Ansicht berühmt(en) *Laufen* zu führen," he wrote in his diary.¹⁷⁴ Despite his intolerance, he referred to Dessauer's "wirklich unermüdliche Gefälligkeit" which must indeed have been apparent, if Bogner took cognizance of it.¹⁷⁵

In his zeal to entertain Grillparzer, Dessauer invited him to a picnic at which another Jewish family was to be present. The possibility of having to spend an afternoon in such company completely unnerved Bogner who stated his reaction thus: "—worüber mir jedes Haar zu Berge stand, und es mir kalt über den Rücken lief, zum Glücke für mich acceptirte diess". Here the diary ends.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² W. II, II, pp. 171f.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ W. II, II, p. 172. Bogner died the following year of tuberculosis.

Judging by the words "zum Glücke" we may assume that Grillparzer did not accept this invitation, perhaps out of consideration for the feelings of his youthful companion. (*sic!*) What the real reason was for his refusal to join Dessauer is, of course, not known. It was hardly the mere presence of the Jewish family that prompted it.

Grillparzer was introduced to the Bachers by Bauernfeld in 1834 when the two of them were still good friends. The latter had found the two Bacher daughters so interesting that he decided to bring Grillparzer to meet them. There is no indication of Grillparzer's opinion about the Bacher family. He did express one about Helene Bacher who was an unusual and very talented girl. In his diary Bauernfeld wrote that she had sent him a Mozart requiem and a wreath of her own hair, adding: "Grillparzer ist entzückt von ihr.—'es ist gefährlich so zu sein, wie sie ist,' sagte er, 'aber sie kann es wagen.'" ¹⁷⁷ Just what about her caused Grillparzer to say that, is not known. He appreciated her ingenuous manner and was a frequent visitor at her home for a few months. In January 1835 Bauernfeld wrote in his diary that Grillparzer ceased coming there while he himself was a daily visitor. The fact that the Bacher firm went bankrupt at that time, caused Bauernfeld to come even more often to console the family. ¹⁷⁸ His constant presence may have caused Grillparzer to stay away since he was at that time beginning to be annoyed with Bauernfeld.

Just about one year after Helene Bacher had met Grillparzer, she wrote a letter to him which indicates the directness of her personality. It begins thus: "Es mag wohl eine der schmerzlichen Empfindungen sein, in dem Glauben an einen Freund getäuscht zu werden," and continues with the assertion that Grillparzer is too good to let her experience that in her present mood and that he is too noble to refrain from visiting her after she assures him that his presence means a great deal to her. Should her request appear startling to him, in view of the short time that he knows her, she adds, then she begs his pardon "um des Begriffes willen, der in mir wohnt, was der *Mensch* vom *Menschen* erwarten darf." ¹⁷⁹ Whether he went to see her after this strange invitation

¹⁷⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁹ W. III, 2, p. 143.

is not known. He was at her home on December 20, 1846 with Castelli and Meyerbeer, from which one can conclude that he had not completely severed his association with the Bacher family.¹⁸⁰

Grillparzer often borrowed books from Simon Levi who had a large library, and frequently he kept the books for quite some time before returning them.¹⁸¹ His contact with Levi seems to have been limited to that, and occurred largely around 1859.

Grillparzer's friendship with Max Löwenthal began in 1818 with the latter's poem, *An den Verfasser des Trauerspiels Sappho*.¹⁸² Three years later Löwenthal wrote him a very friendly letter from Paris expressing regret that Grillparzer had not taken the trip with him as he had urged him to.¹⁸³ Their friendship continued for many years. They saw each other often in the 'thirties, and Löwenthal was one of the contributors to the Album presented to Grillparzer by Concordia in 1844.¹⁸⁴

The contact with Heinrich Bornstein was of a business nature. The latter had produced *Der Traum ein Leben* in Linz in 1835, and although Grillparzer had announced the year before in Bäuerle's *Allgemeine Theaterzeitung* that nobody could produce any of his dramas without the payment of a fee, Bornstein had not done so. Whereupon Grillparzer called his attention to that fact in a long letter. After stating that he was honored to have Bornstein produce his play, he entered into a lengthy discussion of the difficulties of staging and producing dramas.¹⁸⁵ Since there is no further correspondence concerning the matter, we may assume that Bornstein paid the required fee and that Grillparzer had no difficulties with him on that score.

Regarding Grillparzer's association with Bertha Semler, there is only a cryptic note in his diary of 1840. "Bertha S. . . . ist gestorben. Die Frauenzimmer, die je Interesse an mir genommen, haben sich alle frühzeitig aus der Welt gemacht."¹⁸⁶ What this interest may have been or what its manifestations were so far as Grillparzer was concerned, is a matter of conjecture.

Having examined the direct contacts which Grillparzer had with

¹⁸⁰ Bauernfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, III, 1, p. 348.

¹⁸⁴ *Gesp.*, VI, pp. 185f.; p. 190.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 10, p. 315.

¹⁸¹ W. III, 3, p. 207; cf. also p. 215.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

¹⁸⁵ W. III, 2, pp. 124f.

individual Jews in all walks of life, and having examined, wherever possible, his comments on these contacts, we are ready to see what he thought of Jews collectively. As individuals, he judged them in the same way as he judged all the other people he met, without concern for their race or religion. He either admired them, as he did Frankl, Börne, Rahel Varnhagen, Weilen, Betty Paoli, Wertheimer, Dessauer, and Meyerbeer, or he hated them, as he did Saphir. In each case his attitude was conditioned by the character of the individual involved, and never by the fact that he was a Jew. It will be interesting to see whether this tolerant attitude is discernible also in his opinion of Jews collectively. Will his experiences with the many individual Jews whom he knew, affect his feelings toward them as a group?

CHAPTER IV

GRILLPARZER'S DIRECT EXPRESSION OF OPINION ABOUT JEWS

There are relatively few comments which Grillparzer made about the Jews collectively. Those that he did make, are to be found chiefly in occasional diary entries, and betray, as a whole, an apparently unfriendly attitude toward them. This, however, is usually influenced by other factors. Thus, when he left Vienna for his trip to Germany on August 21, 1826, he was both discouraged and in ill health. The presence of a Vienna merchant and two Jews in the same coach with him annoyed him somewhat.¹ After traveling all night in their company, he wrote in his diary: "Den Tag im Wagen zugebracht, wie man ihn nach einer durchwachten Nacht, zerschüttet von Hitze und dem ungeheuersten Staube gequält, vis à vis von 2 Juden zubringen kann."² It is doubtful whether he would have been so very much upset by their mere presence, if he had not had a serious digestive disturbance at the time, and had not been subjected to numerous physical annoyances as a result. This fact, coupled with the heat, the dust, and the lack of sleep certainly conditioned his reactions to his fellow travelers.

En route to Germany he visited the ghetto in Prague. His impression of it is best given in his own words. "In der Judenstadt gewesen. Schmutz, Schmutz, Schmutz. Man begreift warum dies Volk keine Schweine isst, es wäre eine eigentliche Hyophagie (Anthropophagie). Und doch sah ich 3 der schönsten Mädchen, die ich je gesehen, in dieser Judenstadt, und alle 3 offenbar Jüdinnen. Die eine beinahe griechisch und ideal, die anderen menschlich, leiblich, fleischlich, was man will, aber äusserst hübsch."³ The first part of his comment may well indicate that Grillparzer either never had visited the Vienna ghetto which must have resembled the one in Prague, or that he had not received a sufficiently strong impression to make any comment about it. His reference to the dirt certainly does not indicate any malice or prejudice. That it was no

¹ W. II, 8, p. 221.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

exaggeration of the actual conditions, is well known to anybody who ever studied ghetto life, no matter how superficially. The fact that Grillparzer took the trouble to visit the ghetto attests to an interest in the Jews and their mode of living. Since this visit was made at a time when his contacts with Jews were still more or less limited, it is quite possible that he went in search of material in connection with *Die Jüdin von Toledo* which occupied his attention at the time. He may have looked for a prototype of Isaak and he undoubtedly saw many Jews there who had the physical, if not the mental, characteristics of this old man. That one of the three beautiful Jewesses influenced his creation of Rahel is quite likely, even though the direct inspiration for her character came from a Christian woman, Marie von Smolenitz.⁴

The husband of Caroline Pichler received an even worse jolt when he strayed into the *Judenstadt* of Prague in 1825. The garrulous Caroline related in her *Denkwürdigkeiten* how shocked he was at the sight of the old, dilapidated houses, the narrow and winding streets, the *Trödelmarkt*, and the general filth of the place.⁵ Although she gave a more detailed description of the scene, it is by no means more effective than Grillparzer's triple use of the word "Schmutz" which gives the imagination free reign to conjure up the misery, poverty, and dirt which were the lot of the Jew.

In her discussion of the Jewish question, Caroline Pichler, who had many friends among the Jews, made a number of observations which are expressed in Grillparzer's *Jüdin von Toledo*. In analyzing the Jewish character and its tendency to be officious, she pointed out that the bad traits of the Jews might well be the result of the pressure and intolerance imposed upon them by Christians. The similarity of the above conjecture to the words of King Alphons regarding the treatment of the Jews in which he says in part:

⁴ This view is held particularly by Alfred Klar: "Der Anblick einer schönen Jüdin im Prager Ghetto, das Grillparzer am 24. Aug. 1826 besuchte, soll sich so tief in das Gedächtnis des Dichters eingeprägt haben, dass ihm noch Jahrzehnte später die Züge unserer Heimatsgenossen bei der Gestaltung seiner Rahel vorschwebten." "Nach Alfred Klars Bericht," 1891, reprinted in *Gesp.*, III, p. 301.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 203.

„Was sie verunziert, es ist unser Werk;
Wir lähmen sie und grollen, wenn sie hinken,“⁶

is obvious. It is quite possible that Grillparzer may have talked to her about this very question, or that her attitude may have influenced him to the extent of having him immortalize it in the words of the king. Since Grillparzer associated with the Pichlers in the 'twenties, he may even have compared his impression of the ghetto with Pichler. He probably discussed the Jewish question at the Pichler home, particularly in view of Caroline Pichler's interest in the plight of the Jews. Regarding this, she wrote: "Es wäre also meiner Meinung oder vielmehr meinem Gefühle nach allerdings wünschenswert, dass die christlichen Regierungen in und auch ausser Europa sich ernstlich und gutmütig mit der Verbesserung des Loses der Juden beschäftigten, dass sie daran dächten, einen gesetzlichen Zustand für sie festzustellen, der ihnen die nötigen Rechte sicherte. . . ."⁷ As a liberal devoted to the philosophy of Joseph II, Grillparzer must have shared this view. His determination to vote for the liberal laws of 1868, which insured the emancipation of the Jews by granting religious freedom to all and by restricting the powers of the Church, is evidence in support of this assumption.

In 1836 Grillparzer made two diary entries about Jews. In one he stated that upon his arrival in London he asked a Jew who was near him, where they were supposed to go upon landing, and then followed him into the custom house.⁸ The second comment is somewhat more telling: "Ein deutscher Jude ist da, ein Platzbedienter, der mich in seine Klauen zu bekommen sucht."⁹ Neither of these two references to Jews is in any way indicative of a definite attitude toward them.

While traveling in the Balkans in 1843, Grillparzer noted in his diary that, although one of his companions on the boat was from Berlin and possibly a Jew, he was not unpleasant.¹⁰ It would be far from the truth to use the above as a basis for any generalization regarding his views about the inhabitants of Berlin or the

⁶ W. I, 7, p. 30.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 212.

⁸ W. II, 10, pp. 82f.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

¹⁰ W. II, 11, p. 25; cf. also p. 31.

Jews, even though, on another occasion in 1858, he wrote in his diary: "Den Berlinern merkt man ewig an, dass ihre Bildung von Franzosen und Juden ihren Anfang genommen hat."¹¹ This may or may not indicate that he regretted that such was the case, or that he considered it to their detriment that their education was influenced by the French and the Jews.

That Grillparzer found a Jew and his wife the most interesting people in Tatzmannsdorf, is shown in a letter which he wrote to Kathi Fröhlich on July 31, 1852. After complaining about the lack of interesting conversation and about the type of people there, he added that the most tolerable of all were a Jew from Prague and his wife, who would probably stay for a while since they arrived at the same time as he.¹²

In addition to his direct reference to Jews, Grillparzer showed his interest in the Jewish religion in various comments in his diary. By far the most interesting of these was made in 1846, in which he tried to rationalize the origin of monotheism among the Jews. Their monotheistic conception might, he felt, be due to the fact that they were originally an isolated and hated tribe, which did not dare assume that more than one celestial being could possibly be concerned about them. It is the same separation which made them trace all humanity from one couple, he believed, adding that the Jews did not doubt the other gods, but merely regarded their God as the highest and most important and did not want to share him with the other peoples. He concluded this analysis with the observation that monotheism as a form of sublimated fetichism may have been much more common in primeval times than is generally believed.¹³ Grillparzer's interest in the essential nature of the Jews began, as we have seen, in his 'teens with his admiration of the heroes of the Old Testament, and continued throughout his life under the stimulus of his numerous contacts with Jews, individually and collectively.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, 12, p. 18.

¹² *Ibid.*, III, 3, p. 93.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 11, p. 114.

CHAPTER V

GRILLPARZER'S INDIRECT EXPRESSION OF OPINION ABOUT JEWS

A. *Die Jüdin von Toledo*

Grillparzer has created two works in which Jewish characters play a very important part, *Die Jüdin von Toledo* and the dramatic fragment *Esther*. Since the former is a complete drama, and since its genesis dates back to an earlier time, even though it was not published until after Grillparzer's death, it merits prior consideration. The most important dates in connection with the history of this drama are, briefly: 1816 first mention of the subject by Grillparzer, 1824 first definite plan, 1872 first staging in Prague, 1873 first staging in Vienna and publication by Cotta.¹

The first entry in Grillparzer's diary relating to the plot of *Die Jüdin von Toledo* reads: "Alphons VIII König von Kastilien verliebt sich in eine Jüdin. Seine Grossen, die ein ihm zugestossenes Kriegsunglück dieser verdammlichen Liebe zuschreiben, lassen das Mädchen ermorden. Alphons ward darüber wahnsinnig. Im J. 1194."² This entry is dated by Sauer as of 1816, although other critics, particularly Lambert, place it in 1813.³

In 1824 Grillparzer wrote a rather detailed plan for *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, giving it even the title under which it was published almost fifty years later. This plan shows clearly that Grillparzer was attracted to the subject by the human element of the story as it concerned the king. The Jewish angle did not interest him apparently, since he does not even refer to it. In this plan Grillparzer relates the story of the inexperienced king, full of book wisdom, but ignorant of life, who is drawn by the sensual charm of a beautiful Jewess into a relationship which eventually costs her her life.⁴ The most important character is Alphons whose inner

¹ Goedeke, *Grundriss*, VIII, p. 453.

² W. II, 7, p. 73.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 7, p. ix.

⁴ W. II, 8, pp. 130f. The plan reads: "Die Jüdin von Toledo. Trauerspiel. Die Geschichte Alonso des Guten von Kastilien und jener Rahel, die ihn nicht ohne Verdacht der Zauberei, so lange umstrickt, und die zuletzt von den Grossen des Reichs im Einverständnisse mit der Königin, ermordet wurde. Alonso, jünger aufgefasst, als

conflict resulting from his guilty love forms the basis of the drama. The beautiful Jewess is merely a means to bring about his eventual reform. Why Grillparzer chose a Jewess for this we shall see when we discuss the literary influences on *Die Jüdin von Toledo*.

Although he had written the plan in 1824, Grillparzer wrote a small part of this drama in 1827 only to stop again. He did not work on it until ten years later, at which time he wrote rapidly up to the middle of Act II, and then lost interest again.⁵ It was not until 1848 that he resumed work on this drama. This renewed interest in the story of a king's illicit love affair and its consequences, was due in part to the notoriety of the love affair of Ludwig of Bavaria and the dancer Lola Montez.⁶ He finally completed *Die Jüdin von Toledo* in the 'fifties.

There are two sources for this drama: one, and by far the more important one, is the literary source, particularly Lope de Vega's *Las paces de los Reyes y Judía de Toledo*, and the other is the personal source, consisting of his own experiences in his affair with Marie von Smolenitz-Daffinger. Although Grillparzer became acquainted with the poetic works of Lope de Vega in 1820, it was not until 1824 that he began to read his dramas. In that year he

er, nach der Geschichte, zur Zeit jenes Liebesverhältnisses eigentlich war, ein, im guten Sinne des Wortes wohl erzogener Prinz; ohne die Liebe eigentlich je zu kennen, schon früh mit einer Prinzessin vermählt, in der er für alles Befriedigung findet was der Umkreis seiner Wünsche bisher erreichte. Ein Herz und eine Seele mit ihr, beide gutartig, edel, vornehm, wohlgezogen, wie Bruder und Schwester. Das Volk betet ihn an, die Grossen sehen mit scheuer Ehrfurcht was er ist, und was er zu werden verspricht, er selbst fühlt sich glücklich in dem ungestörten Gleichgewichte seines Wesens. Was er thut ist kräftig, denn er hat noch nie die Erfahrung einer demüthigenden Unzulänglichkeit gemacht, was er spricht ist Weisheit, aber erlernte, Bücher-Weisheit, die Welt hat ihn noch nicht in ihre strenge Lehre genommen. Alles ist gut, da erscheint jene Jüdin, und ein Etwas wird in ihm rege, von dessen Daseyn er bis jetzt noch keine Ahnung gehabt: die Wollust. In seinem Garten spazieren gehend, an der Seite seiner Gattin, von Grossen und Volk umgeben, Worte der Güte und Weisheit auswendig, fällt, von Gartenknechten verfolgt, die das Volk der Ungläubigen abzuhalten Befehl haben, fällt die schöne Jüdin zu des Königs Füßen; ihre Arme umfassen seine Füße, ihr üppiger Busen wogt an seine Kniee gepresst und— der Schlag ist geschehen. Das Bild dieser schwellenden Formen, dieser wogenden Kugeln (unter diesem Bilde sind sie seinen Sinnen gegenwärtig) verlässt ihn nicht mehr. Ungeheure Gährung in seinem Innern. Alles was er ist und war, lehnt sich auf gegen das neue, überwältigende Gefühl."

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 7, p. xiii. Rahel's father is still called Ruben.

⁶ W. I, 7, p. xiv. This view is also held by Schäfer, *Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Preussisch-deutschen Politik*, p. 60; Reich, *F. Grillparzers Dramen*, p. 270; Kleinberg, *F. Grillparzer*, p. 112; etc.

read twelve of his dramas, according to an entry in his diary.⁷ It is not known whether his *Judía de Toledo* was one of these. It is interesting to note that Grillparzer considered Lope the Goethe of Spanish literature and Calderon its Schiller.⁸ His interest in these two writers is analogical to his interest in Schiller and Goethe. In his youth he was a great admirer of Schiller and Calderon, and in his later years, of Lope and Goethe.

Although Lope de Vega's drama forms the main source of Grillparzer's *Jüdin*, it is by no means its only source. When Grillparzer first mentioned the plot in 1816, he did not know any Spanish. He most probably got the idea for this plot from Mariana's *History of Spain* which was in the Hofbibliothek where Grillparzer worked at the time.⁹ Lambert doubts that Grillparzer knew Lope's drama even in 1824 when he wrote the first plan.¹⁰ If we consider that Grillparzer had read twelve dramas of Lope de Vega in that year, and had used the same title in his play as Lope, it would seem more likely that he had read his *Judía de Toledo*.¹¹

Although there is no definite proof that Grillparzer knew Cazotte's novel *Rachel ou la belle Juive* which was published in London in 1788, there are a number of similarities between this work and Grillparzer's. In both, the love of the king for the pretty Jewess comes like a sudden sickness after a chaste youth. Both kings become victims of their passion, only to recover and return to their wives and royal duties. In both, the exchange of pictures is used to suggest witchcraft. Lambert feels that Cazotte's influence is most obvious in the character of Isaak. Regarding this he states: "L'attitude lâche et dénaturée du vieil usurier qui, tandis que sa fille est encore étendue sanglante derrière la porte, se préoccupe uniquement d'aller mettre en sureté l'or gagné dans cette aventure, est encore un reste de l'influence que Cazotte a exercée sur la conception de ce personnage."¹² Grillparzer had originally called Rahel's father Ruben, which is the name used by Cazotte. The

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 8, p. 158.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁹ A French translation of the same work appeared in 1725 under the title of *Histoire générale d'Espagne* by Père J. N. Charenton.

¹⁰ *La Juive de Tolède*, p. 260.

¹¹ This view is also held by Sauer, W. I, 7, p. xvii.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 255. A German article by the same author, "Eine Untersuchung der Quellen zur *Jüdin von Toledo*" appears in *Jhb.* XIX, pp. 61ff.

fact that Isaak acts as the procurer is also due to the influence of Cazotte. According to Sauer, Grillparzer took over most of Ruben's revolting characteristics for his Isaak, softening the latter's evil traits by a comic touch.¹³ Since Grillparzer stressed Isaak's avarice more than Gazotte or Lope, we may ascribe this to the influence of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* on which he commented in the spring of 1823.¹⁴ In 1826 this drama was again brought to his attention while he was in Germany. During a visit to Tieck's house the latter read the *Merchant of Venice* to him. "Sein Vorlesen bringt die Wirkung der besten Darstellung auf der Bühne hervor," he remarked.¹⁵ Just how much of an influence Shylock may have had on the creation of Isaak we shall see later.

By far the most exhaustive study of Lope de Vega's influence on Grillparzer was made by Arturo Farinelli who believes that his *Judía de Toledo* was the basis for Grillparzer's *Jüdin von Toledo*.¹⁶ If Grillparzer knew any other Spanish plays dealing with the same theme, he discarded them as far inferior to Lope's, he believes. It was after reading Lope's drama that Grillparzer wrote his plan of 1824, in the opinion of Farinelli.¹⁷ Grillparzer has intensified the problem of the king's affair with the beautiful Rahel by introducing an inner conflict in the soul of Alphons who is torn between a sense of duty to his kingdom and an overpowering sensual attachment to his mistress. This is the tragic motive which is not brought out by Lope de Vega. Lope's king is struck by the beauty of Raquel and is powerless to resist her charms. He does not feel any conflict between his duties as a king and his love for the Jewess, with whom he continues his affair for seven years.¹⁸ If the deserted queen and the grandees of the empire had not killed her, the king would have continued his relations with her indefinitely. In order to forestall the consequences of the king's wrath after the murder of Raquel, an angel appears to the royal couple and brings peace and forgiveness. This *deus ex machina* was, of course,

¹³ W. I, 7, p. xxiv.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 8, p. 123. In Grillparzer's library there was an 1821 edition of Shakespeare's plays.

¹⁵ W. II, 8, p. 231.

¹⁶ *Grillparzer und Lope de Vega*, pp. 147f.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

disregarded by Grillparzer who placed the solution of the problem in the heart of Alphons and not in any supernatural intervention which is essentially medieval.

Lope's Alfonso falls madly in love with Raquel when he comes upon her suddenly while she is bathing in a river. From that moment he is enslaved by his passion which seems to rob him of his reason. Grillparzer's Alphons tries to suppress his emotion when he is suddenly electrified by the touch of the kneeling Rahel. Torn between his strong sense of obligation to the state and his overwhelming physical attraction to Rahel, he does not succumb immediately to his passion. He is at all times aware of his guilt and when he does dedicate himself to the service of the state, he is resolved not to see Rahel again. It is the scepticism of the queen which prevents an immediate reconciliation.

Grillparzer's Rahel is largely his own creation and is based on the character of Marie von Smolenitz-Daffinger. Because he worked from a concrete model, he was able to make of Rahel an individual whose personality is developed with minute detail. The sight of the Jewesses in the ghetto of Prague may have influenced her physical characteristics. She is, as a whole, a much more complicated character than Raquel who wants to become a Christian and thus share the faith of her beloved. Rahel is incapable of such a thought, and is too much a creature of the flesh to care much about the salvation of her soul. In this she probably takes after her mother, the frivolous and extravagant second wife of Isaak.

Whereas Raquel's sister, Sibila, is a passive person with only an insignificant role, Esther is the fully developed antithesis of her volatile and shallow sister. Sibila is killed in the Lope drama, but Esther utters the last and most significant words of Grillparzer's work. In the character of Isaak, however, Grillparzer has deviated quite a bit from his literary predecessor. David, Isaak's counterpart, appears only twice, once in a short scene with his son Levi, whom Grillparzer omitted entirely, and a second time with Belardo. He has a premonition of the impending tragedy and grieves over Raquel's love affair. Concerning him Farinelli writes: "Er ist weder geizig noch kleinmütig, während Grillparzer Isaak als einen schmutzigen Stockjuden einführt. Von allen mensch-

lichen Eigenschaften hat er bloss zwei entwickelt: die Habgier und den Geiz."¹⁹

Having briefly analyzed the literary sources of *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, we must examine the personal influences, before we can attempt to discuss Grillparzer's treatment of the Jewish characters. As previously stated, the prototype for Rahel was Marie von Smolenitz with whom Grillparzer had a love affair. She was a very inconsistent person, possessing traits which were the direct opposite of one another. She could be severe and generous, a devoted wife and a brazen coquette, secretive over trifles and outspoken about really important matters, pleasure loving in the extreme and withal morose. Her ascetic eyes and voluptuous mouth were but a physical confirmation of her contradictory nature. It is no wonder, therefore, that Grillparzer was often at a loss to understand her. In one of his letters to her he reiterates the fact that he could never understand her, adding: "Doch ist es nicht natürlich! Der Mensch versteht alles, nur das Völlig-Einfache nicht, und—Marie!—das Unerhört-Künstliche!"²⁰ Since she was both of these, it made it all the more difficult.

Grillparzer's interest in Marie began in the middle 'twenties. She was an unusually attractive woman whose appeal was essentially physical. Grillparzer may have had his own reactions to her in mind when he wrote of Rahel's effect on the senses of Alphons. Just as the king tried to conquer his feelings for the Jewess, so Grillparzer, too, tried to crowd this "half demon, half child" out of his consciousness. This was one of the contributing factors which prompted his trip to Germany in 1826. Instead of forgetting her completely, he found himself even more in love with her when she married one of his friends, the painter Moritz Daffinger, in 1827. With this marriage the eternal triangle came into being, with Grillparzer, the lover, acting as the mediator and peace-maker whenever the husband and wife quarreled.²¹ That this treacherous role disgusted him can be readily understood, yet the hold of Marie on his senses was so great for a while that he was willing to sacrifice honor and loyalty for her fickle favors. Ironically

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 163.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

²⁰ W. II, 8, p. 304.

enough, the very qualities which attracted him to her, her inexhaustible sensuality and her volatile temperament, frequently repelled him also, so that he was in a constant emotional maelstrom.

How unhappy his attachment for Marie made Grillparzer, who was eighteen years older than she, is best indicated in the following excerpt from one of his letters to her: "Schilt mich nicht, dass ich argwöhnisch bin! Ich habe ein Recht zum Argwohn. Du bist das schönste Weib; nie hat mein Aug eine schönere gesehen! Ich aber? Wer mich nicht abschreckend findet, thut mir viel Ehre an. Bist jung! Ich könnte dem Verhältnis der Jahre nach, zwar nicht dein, wohl aber der Vater deiner Schwester sein, die fünf Jahre jünger ist als du. Du blühst in Fülle und Gesundheit. . . . Ich habe dagegen nichts aufzuweisen, als ein Bisschen Ruhm, erkaufte um den Glanz und die Freuden der Jugend."²² Not only was he tortured by a feeling of inferiority and jealousy, but the knowledge that she was making a fool of him increased his misery. Although he chided himself for being a fool and tried to convince himself that he had ample reason to mistrust her, he was powerless at the sight of her. He reviled her, called her a tricky coquette and blamed her for having such power to ensnare him.²³ Yet, in spite of it all he was happy at times. In 1832, after the spell had been broken, he wrote in his diary: "Die erste Liebesperiode mit dieser Frau war wirklich ungemein reizend. Aber dasselbe was Anfangs an sie zieht, stösst unendlich zurück. Ihre Vorzüge und Fehler vereinigen sich in Einer Eigenschaft: sie ist ein Kind."²⁴

Grillparzer tried to depict the complex character of Marie in the *Tristia ex Ponto* poems, written between 1824 and 1833. In these poems there are many traits listed which Grillparzer has immortalized in Rahel. In *Verwünschung* written in 1827 at a time when he was also working on *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, he wrote in part:

„Nun aber löscht des Trachtens böse Tücke
Nicht einen Zug des Reizes der dich schmückt,
Indes, verschönt durch einen deiner Blicke,
Der Bosheit Stich, wie Unschuldshauch entzündet.“²⁵

²² W. II, 8, p. 301.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 9, p. 82.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 10, p. 133.

In *Trennung*, written in the same year, he reiterated his inability to comprehend her contradictory nature, adding that she was a riddle to him. Two years later he mentioned the same thing in his diary and wondered whether her naiveté was real, in which case he added, "hat mein vorschneller Unsinn das einzige verscherzt, was mich aus meiner gegenwärtigen Lage noch hätte reißen können; oder es ist Lüge, und dann, dann freilich ist alles in Ordnung."²⁶

It is very difficult indeed to understand Rau's analysis of Grillparzer's love life, after an examination of his affair with Marie Daffinger. According to Rau, Grillparzer never "fought a battle with passion" and was temperamentally incapable of having normal sexual relations with women.²⁷ He does, however, refer to Marie as Grillparzer's "letzte grosse Leidenschaft."²⁸ This is *ipso facto* a refutation of his own interpretation of Grillparzer, as is also the belief of Sonnleithner that Marie had a daughter by Grillparzer.²⁹ One has but to read his correspondence with Marie, not to mention his love poems or his understanding of the strong sensual attachment between Alphons and Rahel and Hero and Leander, to feel that Rau has interpreted Grillparzer more in keeping with modern psychological trends than with the facts in the case. Grillparzer did fight a battle with passion vicariously through Alphons and actually with Marie Daffinger.³⁰

It takes but a casual reading of *Die Jüdin von Toledo* to discover the Christian Marie as the prototype of the Jewess whose capricious coquetry and exasperating childishness hold Alphons under the same spell as Marie's held Grillparzer. As previously mentioned, Grillparzer worked on *Die Jüdin von Toledo* in 1827 when his love for Marie had been stimulated by her marriage to Daffinger. In the throes of this love he was unwilling to put all of Marie's bad traits into the character of Rahel and so he relinquished this drama and immortalized, instead, her noble qualities

²⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 8, pp. 338f.

²⁷ *Grillparzer und sein Liebesleben*, p. 77.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

²⁹ *Gesp.*, I, p. 334.

³⁰ Marie was a close friend of Siegmund von Wertheimstein, a member of the family whose home Grillparzer frequented. Marie's relations with Wertheimstein came at a time when Grillparzer was no longer in love with her, so that he was probably unaffected by the affair. Wertheimstein settled a large sum of money on Marie, part of which she used to endow an institution in his name.

in Hero. After a lapse of many years during which his love for Marie died and he was again able to work on the character of Rahel, he returned to the writing of *Die Jüdin von Toledo*.

There is no indication that any other personal experience figured in the creation of the characters. His numerous contacts with Jews seem not to have influenced his Jewish characters at all. Grillparzer may have thought of the fine Jewish women he knew and admired, as Josefine von Wertheimstein, Rahel Varnhagen or Betty Paoli, in his creation of Rahel's sister, Esther, or of the heroine of the fragment, but this is merely a guess. As for Isaak, Grillparzer did not know any Jew so devoid of all decency and any compensatory traits as to serve as a prototype for this inhuman wretch. He may have seen his physical counterpart in the ghetto of Prague, but Isaak's character was modelled definitely along the lines of his literary progenitors, Ruben, David, and Shylock. As a whole, it is safe to state that Grillparzer's Jewish characters in *Die Jüdin von Toledo* as well as in *Esther* are conditioned by their literary predecessors and by the exigencies of the action of the dramas, and not by Grillparzer's personal attitude toward the Jews. With this in mind we are now ready to examine his treatment of Jewish characters.

Of the three Jewish characters Rahel is the least Jewish, nor is she the most important, despite the fact that the drama is named after her. She is there more as a foil for the unfolding of the story of King Alphons, of his transgression and final repentance. After the third act she does not even appear on the stage, not even as a corpse at the end. Since, however, she is responsible for the Jewish angle of the drama, she merits first consideration.

Of all the characters in *Die Jüdin von Toledo* Rahel is the most original and independent creation of Grillparzer, owing little to her literary precursors. The fact that he made her a Jewess is due primarily to dramatic necessity, as well as to literary and historical influences. As a Jewess, Rahel and her party are isolated.³¹ She has neither following nor rights which might complicate the main problem of the drama. It is not, however, Rahel's Jewish

³¹ Cf. Harold Lenz, *Grillparzer's Political Ideas and "Die Jüdin von Toledo"*, doc. diss., New York University, 1934, p. 167, for a discussion of the conflict between the party of the Jewess and the state.

origin which is the cause of conflict and eventual murder, but her illicit affair with the king who neglects his duties to the state as a result of it. It was essentially the purely human angle of the king's experiences in the grip of sensuality and its effect upon the welfare of his kingdom, which attracted Grillparzer, and not the Jewish factor.

Because of the fact that an actual person served as the model for Rahel's character, and also because Grillparzer himself had suffered untold anguish from the very traits which he immortalized in Rahel, he frequently overloads his characterization with untold minutiae of detail. She is a frivolous, impetuous, and carefree creature whose innate vanity and foolishness have caused her to feel that every one of her whims must be gratified; that whatever enters her silly little head must be translated into action immediately; that she lives solely for her own pleasure, taking everything and giving nothing. Thus, having made up her mind to trespass in the king's garden against the admonition of her father and sister, she goes in, little thinking or caring about the consequences. She is concerned only with the effect she will make upon the king. Sure of her good looks, she knows that he will ask who the beautiful Jewess is.³² In her imagination she is maliciously picturing the envy of her friends, whose recklessness is not as great as hers.³³ Withal, she is seized with fear when Isaak and Esther run away at the approach of the king. In her sudden panic she shouts imperiously:

„Ich will nicht allein sein! Hört ihr?
Bleibt:—Sie gehn—O weh mir, weh!
Ich will nicht allein sein! Hört ihr?“³⁴

Feeling herself at the mercy of the angry guards, she drops to the king's feet clasping his knees in search of protection. As she pleads for her safety, she may realize what emotional upheaval her mere touch has created in the king's heart. In this plea she shows that her father's sense of value has not been entirely lost upon her. Her quick appraisal of her jewels and her kerchief is her only definitely Jewish trait which, however, she merely uses with coquettish purpose as she removes them.

³² W. I., 7 p. 8.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 7, p. 9.

„Und alles, was ich habe,
 (ihr Armband ablösend)
 diese Spangen,
 Das Halsgeschmeid' und dann dies teure Tuch,
 Der Vater hat's gekauft um vierzig Pfund,
 Echt indisches Geweb', ich geb es hin,
 Nur lasst mein Leben mir, ich will nicht sterben!“³⁵

Her stress of the price of the possessions which she is willing to give as ransom, is too ludicrous to be more than playful when one considers that she is talking to the king and not to some brigand. In her calmer moments, Rahel is contemptuous of her father's greed and deliberately teases him about it. At one time she purposely hid one of her earrings and told Isaak that she had thrown it away, just to see him run off moaningly in search of it.³⁶

The numerous commentators on Rahel's character have, as a whole, condemned her and have, at the same time, considered her irresponsible for her actions because of her inability to distinguish between right and wrong. She is regarded as the female of the species who gives full play to her instincts to adorn herself and to ensnare the male. She is incapable of understanding such abstractions as morals or ethics. Tibal says of her: "Rahel est la femme avec tous ses instincts primitifs; frivole, coquette, menteuse, vaniteuse, sensuelle, avide d'existence pour jouir des apparences de ce monde, craignant atrocement des ténèbres de la mort. Elle est la nature dans sa beauté la plus brillante et la plus éphémère."³⁷ Volkelt feels that Rahel is sensuality itself, that her soul is nothing but "flatternde, zuckende, blitzende Sinnlichkeit. Tand und Flitter, Putz und Schmuck sind beherrschende Werthe für sie."³⁸ She cares as little for the future as for the past; to her the present is all absorbing. Her entire existence is centered upon her momentary whims. Alphons was well aware of her paradoxical nature when he called her "Du albern spielend, thöricht-weises Kind," just as Grillparzer was aware of the same quality in Marie.

True to her contradictory nature, the naïve and simple Rahel is also shrewd and designing. Thus, she deliberately avoids thank-

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

³⁷ *Études sur Grillparzer*, p. 171.

³⁸ "Grillparzer als Dichter des Willens zum Leben", *Jhb.* X, p. 26.

ing Alphons because she wants him to come to her for his thanks. She also insists upon the picture exchange in spite of Esther's advice to the contrary. Although the king maintains that he would never see her again, she knows that he will, because she is sure of her power over him. As the chains of the flesh are loosening their hold on Alphons and he leaves Retiro in order to attend to pressing affairs of the state, Rahel shows that she is well aware of her difficult position. She cries petulantly:

„Man gönnt mir keine Freude, keinen Trost,
Hält mich in abgeschiedner Sklaverei.
Wär' ich erst nur daheim in Vaters Hause,
Wo alles mir zu Willen und zu Dienst,
Indes ich hier ein Wegwurf der Verachtung.“³⁹

Living alone with Alphons, Rahel must have come to realize what dangers lurked for her in the absence of the king. She is, however, by no means eager to serve and please him in order to hold him to her, but is constantly indulging her many whims which her ever active fancy dictates to her. It never occurs to her that she might become a burden to the king of whom she exacted too high a price for her favors. When it is too late, when Alphons has already left Retiro, she admits to Esther:

„Er liebt mich nicht, ich hab' es längst gewusst.“⁴⁰

At no time, however, has she made any attempt to make herself worthy of his love.

From the moment when Rahel grasped his knees and leaned her head against them, the conflict in the king's soul began. The battle between suddenly stirred desire, and duty, between the need to gratify his awakened senses and his obligation to the state and to his wife, crowded all else out of his consciousness. It is natural that a man like Alphons should be ensnared by Rahel's voluptuous charm. Being married to a frigid woman, the direct physical and emotional opposite of the fiery Jewess, he has never really known passion. Thus, when aroused by Rahel he becomes oblivious of everything else but the will to possess her. His own feelings shock him because he never suspected his dormant sensuality. Lack of

³⁹ W. I, 7, p. 56.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

time and opportunity, as well as a strong sense of duty have kept him from indulging in amorous peccadillos. He is, therefore, subconsciously ripe for an experience with a woman of Rahel's type. At her touch he is seized as with a fever from which he does not completely recover until he looks at the cold corpse of his in-amorata and suddenly discovers indications of evil traits he had never suspected.

As Rahel herself sensed, Alphons never really loved her. Had he felt anything approaching love, he could not have turned from her lifeless body as he did, nor could he have assuaged his wrath by post mortem disclosures of her character. What he felt for her was a powerful physical attraction, which diminished in direct proportion to the gratification of his desires. Betty Paoli, to whom Grillparzer talked about the subject, believes that Alphons is attracted to Rahel primarily by a curiosity and a feeling of awe before an entirely new and beautiful world.⁴¹ From his own words it is evident that he had no respect nor admiration for Rahel as an individual; what he was attracted by was her unrepressed childishness and gay temperament. Her very indulgence of her own caprice made her appear charming to him. She was to Alphons a pleasant and thrilling diversion, an interlude in his life from which he could turn at will.

His reaction at the sight of his dead mistress has elicited a number of critical disagreements. Most critics feel that Alphons is shockingly heartless. He pardons the murderers too readily and walks out with them, leaving the corpse of the Jewess to the bitter Esther and the cowardly Isaak. Here, as nowhere else, do we see so clearly the need for making Isaak a wretch, otherwise our resentment at the king's actions would indeed be great. As it is, Isaak's behavior motivates Esther's feelings that Rahel's own people were equally as guilty. Lambert, however, is not satisfied with the ending, stating: "Le spectateur est en réalité choqué par l'insensibilité et le brusque changement d'attitude d'Alphonse: ce roi qui a promis par tous les serments de protéger sa maîtresse, puis de la venger, passe sans transition à l'oubli et au pardon; après avoir juré la mort de tous les meurtriers, il se calme in-

⁴¹ *Franz Grillparzer und seine Werke*, p. 62; cf. also *Gesp.*, I, p. 223.

stantanément, pardonne à tous les coupables, fiance Garzeran dont le rôle a été somme toute fort peu honorable; et le cortège part en musique tandis que le cadavre de la malheureuse Rachel gît pantelant encore dans la chambre voisine."⁴² Scherer, too, feels that Rahel's end is unjustified, and that no amount of motivation can remove the impression that she is a victim over whose body the murderers congratulate each other with their still bloody hands.⁴³ Bulthaupt also sees a weakness in the ending. Although the king is right from a political and moral viewpoint, we feel more sympathy with the dead Rahel than with him. It is not good that we have to agree with Esther's condemnation of the king and his court for their brutality, he believes.⁴⁴ Lublinsky shares the same view: "In der That muss dem Dichter vorgeworfen werden, dass es ihm nicht gelungen ist, die mittelalterliche Moral einer ganz äusserlichen Sühne in moderner Weise psychologisch zu vertiefen. . . . Hier konnte der Dichter seinem mittelalterlichen Stoff keine Form leihen, welche dem modernen Bewusstsein von Schuld und Sühne auch nur entfernt entspricht."⁴⁵

Among the critics who feel that the ending is satisfactory is Lier who sees no cruelty in it. Rahel is necessary to bring about a catharsis in Alphons. "Sie ist genug geädelt, wenn sie einem edleren Menschen hilft, sich auf sein besseres Selbst zu besinnen."⁴⁶ Sauer, too, feels that her death is not too dear a price for the maturity which Alphons gains as a result of his relationship with Rahel.⁴⁷ According to Lessing, Rahel's death was the only logical means of restoring the *status quo*. She had alienated the king from his people and his queen, had endangered the welfare of the country, and had robbed the king of his peace of mind and his self-respect.⁴⁸

Whether one agrees with the first or with the second group of these critics, one must admit that Rahel died unmourned and unavenged. The king's insistence on seeing her corpse is more due to a need to stimulate his desire for revenge than to anything else.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, pp. 275f.

⁴³ Franz Grillparzer, p. 283.

⁴⁴ *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*, Bd. 3, p. 100.

⁴⁵ Grillparzers *Esther und Rahel von Toledo*, p. 724.

⁴⁶ Grillparzers *Jüdin von Toledo*, p. 340.

⁴⁷ W. 1893 ed. I, p. 85.

⁴⁸ Grillparzer und das neue Drama, p. 138.

He was well aware of the fact that his dalliance with Rahel had created a crisis in his kingdom and he subconsciously felt that her death was necessary to save him for his kingdom. He was, therefore, more in sympathy with the assassins than appears on the surface. When he left her in order to return to Toledo he was already tired of Rahel. He might also have known that she would be in danger without his protection. His manner of disposing of her does not indicate any particular feeling for her.

„Das Mädchen aber selbst, sie sei entfernt!
Mag dann mit einem Mann sie ihres Volks—
Ob das zwar nicht—Die Weiber dieses Stamms
Sind leidlich, gut sogar—Allein die Männer
Mit schmutz'ger Hand und engem Wuchersinn,
Ein solcher soll das Mädchen nicht berühren.“⁴⁹

It is not jealousy which prompts him to change her fate from marriage to exile. He does not want to share that which he once possessed with a dirty and greedy Jew.

His accurate and objective analysis of his mistress shows that his love for her is dead. He lists the same traits in her which Grillparzer had found in Marie to a large extent.

„Sieh nur, du hast das Mädchen nicht gekannt.
Nimm alle Fehler dieser weiten Erde,
Die Thorheit und die Eitelkeit, die Schwäche,
Die List, den Trotz, Gefallsucht, ja die Habsucht,
Vereine sie, so hast du dieses Weib.“⁵⁰

In view of these words one must disagree with Wedel-Parlow who sees a tragic ending for Alphons in Rahel's death. "Die Besinnung kehrt zurück—doch sie macht ihn nicht frei, sie zeigt ihm, dass er eine unheilbare Todeswunde davongetragen hat; ein tieftragischer Ausgang, . . ." ⁵¹ Without going into all the psychological subtleties involved, one can accept his reaction at the sight of Rahel's corpse as very natural. Alphons was attracted to her primarily by his senses. He never loved her. Her animation, her natural and unhampered actions fascinated him. At the sight of her lifeless and still body, at the sight of her fear-distorted face from

⁴⁹ W. I, 7, p. 80.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁵¹ *Grillparzer*, p. 188.

which the beauty of life had flown, his senses repelled him. What is more natural? Prompted by his subconscious need for rationalization of the murder, he discovers a certain ugliness in her face which he had never perceived before. Of all the things he might have thought of, he wonders how he had ever considered her beautiful, as though that were the important issue. He is certainly not crushed by remorse nor possessed of a desire to avenge her death. Feeling the guilt of his own transgression, he is willing to expiate his sins by waging a war against the heathen Moors.

Grillparzer was indeed faced with a difficult problem regarding the ending of *Die Jüdin von Toledo*. The fact that there is so much dissatisfaction concerning it, shows that he was not quite successful. He could not make use of the long arm of coincidence as Lope de Vega had done. The king and queen in the Spanish drama meet in church, each unaware of the other's presence, and become reconciled with the aid of an angel. He could also not end the drama with Esther's curse which would have put the onus of the tragedy on the king and his court, whereas Rahel and Isaak were not entirely blameless. It was Rahel who ensnared the king by her recklessness and her subsequent machinations and it was Isaak who gave Garceran Rahel's address. It was also he who misused his false position to aggrandize himself at the expense of the state. Thus Grillparzer makes Esther take back her curse when she sees her father's anxiety over the safety of the treasures he amassed as a result of his daughter's illicit affair. She then says:

„Denkt Ihr noch das?
Im Augenblick des Jammers und der Not.
Dann nehm' ich rück den Fluch, den ich gesprochen,
Dann seid Ihr schuldig auch, und ich—und sie.
Wir stehn gleich jenen in der Sünder Reihe;
Verzeihn wir denn, damit uns Gott verzeihe.“⁵²

It is Isaak's avarice which makes her realize that they are also guilty, and that it is, therefore, not for her to sit in judgment upon the others.

By distributing the guilt between the Jews and the Christians, Grillparzer shows his impartiality. He did not write this drama in

⁵² W. I, 7. p. 105.

order to express his views on the Jews. *Die Jüdin von Toledo* is, as Lenz points out, to be regarded as an expression of Grillparzer's attitude toward the state.⁵³ Although the state is in the end victorious, and the king returns to his duties after discovering an imaginary "bösen Zug" on Rahel's face, he has lost some of the fine moral attributes of his personality. Instead of developing, Alphons has really retrogressed. He now leans literally and figuratively on the shallow and scheming Garceran.

Rahel's sister, Esther, is by far the finest and most admirable character in *Die Jüdin von Toledo*. One feels that Grillparzer was not merely concerned with creating a contrast between her and Rahel, but rather that he enjoyed endowing her with generosity, common sense, loyalty, and devotion. Esther is a courageous person where the welfare of others is concerned. She is ever ready and willing to help her miserly father and her frivolous and impetuous sister, even though the latter seldom heeds her wise counsel. To Rahel's belated admission that Alphons never loved her, she says simply:

„O Schwester! nutzlos ist das späte Wissen,
Das kommt, wenn uns der Schade schon belehrt.
Ich warnte dich, du hast mich nicht gehört.“⁵⁴

Esther is the only one who remains calm and strong after Rahel's murder. When the king, talking of revenge, insists upon seeing the body, she attempts to dissuade him because she fears that this would incite him to violence against his court. She wants to spare the murderers, even though they killed her own sister.

„Tu's nicht, o Herr! Da's nun geschehn,
Lass es geschehen sein. Uns sei der Jammer,
Du trenne dich nicht, Herr, von deinem Volk,“⁵⁵

she pleads, little realizing that the sight of the corpse would arouse the opposite emotions. When she sees that she cannot prevent the king from going into the next room she begs the queen to flee the rage of Alphons. Manrique's reminder that they are Christians elicits from her this answer:

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, p. 102; cf. also p. 115.

⁵⁴ W. I, 7, p. 64.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

„Nun, ihr habt's gezeigt.
Ich lobe mir die Jüdin, weiss es Gott.“⁵⁶

Although glad that she is a Jewess, she is not intolerant of others. She does not really feel that the king is to blame for the tragedy.

Unlike Rahel, she is contemptuous of finery and jewels. She looks at Rahel's adornments which lie scattered around her lifeless body and says thoughtfully to Isaak:

„Da liegen sie, die Trümmer unsres Glücks,
Der bunte Tand, um dessentwillen wir,
Ja wir, nur wir—nicht er, der dort sich schuld gibt—
Die Schwester opferten, dein töricht Kind.
All, was geschieht, ist recht. Wer sich beklagt,
Verklagt sich selbst und seine eigne Torheit.“⁵⁷

Even though she blames herself also for having sacrificed the silly Rahel, we know that she is innocent. Had Rahel and Isaak taken her advice, the entire tragedy would have been avoided.

The finest tribute to Esther is paid to her, ironically enough, by her very opposite, the shallow and selfish Rahel. She says to Garceran:

„Wär' meine Schwester hier! Sie ist besonnen
Und klüger weit als ich; doch fällt der Funke
Von Willen und Entschluss in ihre Brust,
Dann lodert sie in gleichen Flammen auf.
Wär' sie ein Mann, sie wär' ein Held. Ihr Alle
Erläget ihrem Blick und ihrem Mut.“⁵⁸

There is a strong possibility that Rahel and Esther, who had nothing in common, might not even have been sisters. Esther is the daughter of Isaak's first wife, a poor and decent woman. Rahel is the offspring of his second marriage to a rich, vain, and extravagant woman with the same predilection for handsome Christians which we see in Rahel. One of these might even have been Rahel's father, as Isaak himself suspects.⁵⁹ Both girls take after their mothers, which accounts for the dissimilarity in their characters. Where Esther is obedient to her father, even though she could not possibly have admired or loved him, Rahel delights in exasperating him.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 57f.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

She mocks him for his avarice and exasperates him with her extravagance, so that he even resents the very steps she takes because she is wearing out her expensive shoes.⁶⁰

Whereas Rahel shows practically no typically Jewish traits and Esther shows only good and admirable qualities, Isaak is the embodiment of all that is low, mean, and cheap. Grillparzer has endowed him with some of the bad traits which are supposed to be typically Jewish. He has made him into a cringing miser, whose one thought it to make money and to keep that which he already has. He is indeed the personification of the Jew at his worst. At first timorous, and the soul of meekness, he gradually wins the dazed king's favor which he uses to aggrandize himself at the expense of others. At the end Isaak is just a miserable wretch whose only concern is to bring his ill-gotten gold and himself to safety. He is so devoid of all feeling as to be indifferent to his daughter's death, or to the fact that her corpse is in the adjoining room unwept for and unwatched. In his attempt to characterize Isaak as a contemptible creature Grillparzer has almost drawn a caricature.

Concerning Isaak, Geiger states: "Es mag dem jüdischen Leser bedauerlich sein, dass, während bei den vorkommenden jüdischen Frauen äussere und innere Vorzüge in grosser Zahl beigebracht werden, der einzige jüdische Mann, der in dem Stücke erscheint, alle schlechten Eigenschaften besitzt, welche die Ankläger verschiedener Zeiten den Juden zuzuschreiben sich bemüssigt finden."⁶¹ Geiger overlooks the exigencies of the plot which demand just such a character of the father. Grillparzer has more than balanced his offense against Jewish sensibilities by his admirable characterization of Esther. Wurzbach, too, feels that Isaak depicts some of the weaknesses of the Jewish race, adding that he is "eine ans komische streifende Figur."⁶² This opinion is also held by Sauer who believes that Grillparzer has softened the character of Isaak by introducing a comic note.⁶³ Isaak must be a grotesque figure, since he personifies the grotesque conditions in the kingdom resulting from his sudden rise to power.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁶¹ "Die Jüdin von Toledo," *Allgemeine Ztg. d. Judentums*, 1900, p. 46.

⁶² "Die Jüdin von Toledo in Geschichte und Dichtung," *Jhb.* IX, p. 125.

⁶³ *W.* I, 7, p. xxiv.

In order to make Isaak more realistic, Grillparzer has given him a speech which is different from that of the other characters. While his daughters speak the same German as the Christians, Isaak speaks the kind of Judeo-German which Grillparzer may well have heard in the Prague ghetto. It is full of mispronunciations and grammatical mistakes.⁶⁴ Isaak is drawn in such consistently black colors and is so devoid of any redeeming qualities, that we must agree with Farinelli when he states: "Der Dichter scheint diesen Geizhals mit besonderer Vorliebe gezeichnet zu haben, doch tritt uns Isaak zu häufig mit seiner schmutzigen Begierde entgegen. Wir möchten mehr als einmal dem Dichter zurufen: Genug, wir kennen ihn."⁶⁵

It is interesting to note that Isaak's prototype in the Spanish drama is not as cringing a coward and miser. Lope's David is a weak old man, and is not lacking in affection for his children, as is Isaak. It is from Cazotte that Grillparzer took many of the bad traits of Ruben and intensified them into a caricature of an old and miserly Jew. Shakespeare also influenced Grillparzer to some extent. Shylock and Isaak have certain qualities in common, just as Jessica and Rahel have. It is a known fact that Grillparzer had read the *Merchant of Venice* before his completion of *Die Jüdin von Toledo*. It is very likely indeed that he thought of Shylock in creating the character of Isaak.

Both Isaak and Shylock hate the Christians just as the latter hate them.⁶⁶ They both know that "sufferance" is the badge of their tribe and that money is their only weapon in the struggle for existence. Where Shylock, however, has certain redeeming traits, such as his pride, his sincere religious belief, and his love for Jessica, Isaak lacks anything approaching decency. Shylock never sinks to the low depths of Isaak whose sly and contemptible cunning is best seen in the scene where he tricks a poor petitioner to the king into giving him a valuable ring.

Isaak's lust for gold and his unscrupulous misuse of his position in the palace, as the father of the king's mistress, is indeed

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 165.

⁶⁶ Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* (*Collected Works*), Wright ed., Vol. II, p. 349.

revolting. He is proud of his knowledge of gold. When he tells Garceran of Rahel's actions at Retiro, he says:

„Da wählt sie eine Krone sich heraus
Mit Federschmuck—nicht Gold, vergüldet Blech,
Man kennt es am Gewicht, gilt zwanzig Heller—
Legt sich ein schleppend Kleid um ihre Schultern
Und sagt, sie sei die Königin.“⁶⁷

He also boasts to Garceran that the king discusses state and financial matters with him.⁶⁸ In his conversation about the devaluation of the currency, he says:

„Geld, Freund, ist aller Dinge Hintergrund.
Es droht der Feind, da kauft Ihr Waffen Euch,
Der Söldner dient für Sold, und Sold ist Geld.
Ihr esst das Geld, ihr trinkt's, denn was ihr esst,
Es ist gekauft, und Kauf ist Geld, sonst nichts.
Die Zeit wird kommen, Freund, wo jeder Mensch
Ein Wechselbrief, gestellt auf kurze Sicht.“⁶⁹

In Cazotte's novel Ruben also causes an inflation of the currency.

Although Shylock is a miser and a usurer he has a certain amount of principle which Isaak lacks. When Shylock has the opportunity to collect 6000 ducats in lieu of his original loan of 3000, he ignores it and insists upon his revenge instead. Isaak would have taken the money and would have felt that he had made a very good bargain indeed. Shylock is also hurt by the fact that his daughter had run off with a Christian, whereas Isaak is indifferent and probably glad that she chose one with so much wealth and power. At the end, we pity the broken old Shylock who is forced to renounce the faith of his fathers and become a Christian, in addition to losing the suit and all his property. His fate is indeed tragic. When he pleads ill health and begs to be allowed to go home after promising to submit to the terms of the verdict, we do feel sorry for him and for his mistaken notion of revenge. In his plea for the rights of the Jew he rises to heights of eloquence: "I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt

⁶⁷ W. I, 7, p. 32.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? if we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that."⁷⁰ It is doubtful whether Isaak ever gave any such thought to the difficult position of the Jew or to his rights. He is absorbed in his constant quest for money to the exclusion of everything else.

Grillparzer has succeeded so well in depicting Isaak as a miser who would sacrifice everything for money, that we do not quite understand how Rahel managed to obtain the jewels and expensive clothes which she has. We are to believe that Isaak gave her rare jewels when he even begrudges her the very steps she takes.

„So geht sie auf reichen Schuhen;
Nutzt sie ab, frägt nichts danach,
Jeder Schritt gilt einen Dreier.“⁷¹

Thus, in his zeal to endow Isaak with the most hateful traits ever attributed to a Jew, Grillparzer almost defeats his own ends. His Isaak is a *reductio ad absurdum* of Shylock and his avarice, without the latter's moral greatness. He is a grotesque combination of Ruben, David, and Shylock as well as the personification of the wretched inhabitants of the world's ghettos.

Isaak's *raison d'être* is to supply the king with Rahel's address and to serve as a concrete illustration of the harm done to the state and the people by the king's affair with the Jewess. This is best seen in the ring episode and in the monetary inflation. He serves, therefore, as an important factor in making Rahel's death seem more justified. Since his rise to power is due to the fact that Rahel is the king's mistress, and since his power is definitely subversive to the interests of the state, Rahel's murder is necessary to loosen Isaak's leechlike hold on the body politic. He also motivates Esther's final words in which she absolves the king and his court of part of the guilt. At first bitter and resentful, she utters the final and forgiving words of the drama after seeing Isaak's

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 388.

⁷¹ W. I, 7, p. 7.

concern over his money. Due to this very important function which Isaak has in the drama, he has to be the miserable wretch that Grillparzer made of him.

Die Jüdin von Toledo has frequently been considered the work of an anti-Semite, chiefly because of the characters of Isaak and Rahel. Regarding these Trabert reports: "Diese Unarten der Titelheldin sind es auch, die einst in einer Sitzung des Wiener Gemeinderathes einem Antisemiten eine gewisse Berechtigung dazu gaben, gerade im Hinweise auf diese Rahel und ihren als gemeinsten feigen Schacherer gezeichneten Vater Isaak, den Dichter Grillparzer für die Antisemiten zu vindiciren," although he himself does not consider Grillparzer an anti-Semite.⁷² Ehrhard, on the other hand, believes that Grillparzer did not like the Jews and that he united all their revolting traits in Isaak, "für die es ihm sicher an Vorbildern nicht fehlte," he adds.⁷³ He does, however, admit that Grillparzer has created in Esther a fine contrast to the common and ludicrous figure of Isaak. Esther, he says, is a credit to her race and serves as proof of the fact that Grillparzer did not want to lower the Jews for the benefit of the Christians, since he considers all religions of equal merit.⁷⁴ If Ehrhard intended to stamp Grillparzer as an anti-Semite, he weakened his original contention by showing that Grillparzer presented the fine traits of the Jews in Esther, whose tolerant words he admires. His opinion that Grillparzer may have known prototypes of Isaak is not based on fact. As previously shown, his contacts were essentially with superior Jews who did not possess the failings depicted in Isaak. He may have seen Isaaks in the ghetto of Prague, or for that matter, of Vienna, but the impression he got must have been a rather superficial one. He had much more opportunity to observe the traits of the Jews which he depicted in Esther. A number of the Jewish women with whom Grillparzer associated could have served as models for Esther.

As further proof that Grillparzer did not try to give a one-sided treatment to the subject of the Jews, we have the utterances

⁷² Franz Grillparzer, *ein Bild seines Lebens u. Dichtens*, p. 294.

⁷³ Franz Grillparzer, *sein Leben u. sein Werk*, p. 304.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

of King Alphons. When Garceran states that he would not stoop to a love affair with a Jewess, Alphons remarks:

„Ich wette, wenn das Mädchen dir dort oben
Nur einen Blick gegönnt, du wärest Flamme.
Ich selber lieb es nicht, dies Volk, doch weiss ich,
Was sie verunziert, es ist unser Werk;
Wir lähmen sie und grollen, wenn sie hinken.
Zudem ist etwas Grosses, Garceran,
In diesem Stamm von unstedt flücht'gen Hirten:
Wir Andern sind von heut, sie aber reichen
Bis an der Schöpfung Wiege . . .“⁷⁵

After elaborating on the fact that the Jews are an older people than the Christians, he adds:

„Und hat es, Esau-gleich, sein Recht verscherzt,
Wir kreuz'gen täglich zehnmal den Herrn
Durch unsre Sünden, unsre Missetaten,
Und jene haben's einmal nur getan.“⁷⁶

Because of his infatuation, Alphons discovers many virtues in the Jews. This is probably a subconscious attempt on his part to rationalize about Rahel's Jewish origin and thus raise her in his own eyes. He even goes so far as to blame the Christians for the bad traits of the Jews. Whether the views of Alphons are those of Grillparzer is, of course, a moot question. Reich feels that Grillparzer's own opinions are discernible in the words of the king.⁷⁷ As previously shown, Caroline Pichler expressed a similar view at a time when her social contact with Grillparzer was at its height. It is, therefore, possible that he may be giving poetic expression to her views, or that he may have come to share these views after his observation of Jewish life in Prague and Vienna. As a whole, it is much safer to assume that Grillparzer's treatment of the Jewish question and of the characters of Rahel, Esther, and Isaak was conditioned by the needs of the plot and not by his personal views.

B. *Esther*

Grillparzer's dramatic fragment *Esther* has a number of superficial similarities with *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, yet the leading femi-

⁷⁵ W. I. 7, p. 30.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Franz Grillparzer's Dramen, p. 245. Cf. also S. Aschner, "Zur Quellenfrage der *Jüdin von Toledo*," *Euphorion*, XIX, 1912, p. 290.

nine characters of the two, Rahel and Esther, are as dissimilar as two people can possibly be. In both dramas the king falls in love with a beautiful Jewess. In both, the father (Mardochai is as a father to his niece) intends to use the resulting love affair to his own advantage; the miserly Isaak to enrich himself, and the fanatical Mardochai to free and redeem his people. Both these men are instrumental in bringing about the relationship with the king, Isaak by giving Rahel's address to Garceran, and Mardochai by bringing Esther to the court. Finally, in both dramas the king turns from his wife to another woman for love and understanding.

Esther was, as previously stated, first published by Kuh in his *Dichterbuch aus Oesterreich* in 1863.⁷⁸ It was staged for the first time five years later on March 29, 1868 in the Vienna Operntheater.⁷⁹ The genesis of this fragment is not definitely known, but Sauer has established the *terminus a quo* as 1837. He based his conclusion on the type of paper used for the manuscript as well as on the language and style of it.⁸⁰

As in the case of *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, the literary inspiration was Lope de Vega, whose *La hermosa Esther* Grillparzer read in 1824. Because of the maturity of thought and the mastery of dramatic technique which are evident in the fragment it is doubtful whether Grillparzer started to write *Esther* right after reading the Lope drama, which he admired greatly. He most likely came back to the same subject many years later. The beauty and perfection of the fragment make one regret that Grillparzer did not finish it. It would undoubtedly have been one of the finest, if not the finest, of all his works.

In addition to the Spanish drama which Grillparzer knew, he was also acquainted with the biblical story of Esther, as well as Racine's dramatization of it. According to Farinelli, Grillparzer may also have read Flavius Josephus.⁸¹ Since Racine's *Esther* begins where Grillparzer's fragment ends, Grillparzer could not have

⁷⁸ Goedeke, *Grundriss*, VIII, p. 441.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 441.

⁸⁰ W. 1893 ed., I, p. 87.

⁸¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 176. Krauss disagrees with Farinelli in his treatment of the sources of *Esther*, "Die Quellen der Grillparzerschen *Esther*," p. 109: "Dass Grillparzer den Flavius Josephus gelesen habe . . . ist wenig wahrscheinlich; jedenfalls findet sich bei Grillparzer auch nicht die geringste Einzelheit, die er notwendig aus dem griechischen Autor entlehnt haben müsste."

been very much influenced by it. There are, however, some resemblances between the two dramas. In both, Esther grows up in comparative seclusion, and in both, Mardochai is thinking day and night of the misery of his people. These two elements are not particularly stressed in the Bible.⁸² They are, however *per se* no evidence of any direct influence or vital resemblance. Although it is true that Racine was the first one to conceive Esther as a fine and touching figure of great courage and conviction, it does not preclude a similar original conception on Grillparzer's part. In view of the fact that the human elements of the Esther story attracted Grillparzer, rather than the racial question, he would have had to make Esther an unusual person to motivate her choice by Ahasverus. It was not her beauty which won him, but rather her intelligence and sincerity.

There has been a great deal of conjecture and speculation concerning the ending of Grillparzer's *Esther*. How would he have ended this drama? Why did it remain a fragment? Did he lose interest or was he unable to give it a satisfactory conclusion? Was it another example of the problem which Kleist faced in his *Robert Guiskard*? As if to defy anyone from obtaining the real solution, Grillparzer has made a series of contradictory statements about *Esther*. Which of these comments, made to different people at different times, is the correct one? Various critics accept one or the other as the most logical and likely account of Grillparzer's original intention, but none has been definitely established as indisputable evidence.

Grillparzer had talked about the fragment at some length to Robert Zimmermann, Auguste Littrow-Bischoff, and Ludwig August Frankl. On January 6, 1866 Grillparzer received a visit from Zimmermann, whose essays on the Austrian drama had found favor with him. In the course of their conversation Grillparzer said that he had written the last scene of the second act of *Esther* and nothing more. He also stated that he never took detailed notes on his intended dramatizations so that he had forgotten most of

⁸² For a further history of the treatment of the Esther story see Walther Küchler, *Esther bei Lope, Racine und Grillparzer*, pp. 334ff. For Spanish literature on Esther see Farinelli, *op. cit.*, pp. 173f.

his original plan. Regarding the characters, Zimmermann quotes him as saying that the king was to be shown as a weak but noble man and that Esther and Mardochai were to follow the biblical conception of their characters. At the end, everything was to come out well, "mehr wie im Schauspiel." Nobody was to die except Haman. Obviously in response to a leading question, Grillparzer answered: "Die Scene zwischen Esther und dem König? Ja, ja, die ist gut so; das glaube ich auch. Und der Haman? Ja, ja, Sie haben Recht, das wäre so ein rechter versatiler Staatsmann, so eine Art Polonius. Das ist Alles, was ich noch weiss, ich könnte es jetzt nicht mehr weiterführen, wenn ich auch wollte."⁸³

By far the longest and most detailed discussion which Grillparzer had about *Esther* was in 1868 with Auguste Littrow-Bischoff. After seeing the stage production, she visited Grillparzer and told him how well the fragment was received. In his reply he stated that he did not quite know how he came to have written only this part of the drama, inasmuch as he had a complete work in mind.⁸⁴ This part of his remark is in agreement with his words to Zimmermann made two years earlier. The remainder of his discussion differs completely. After pointing out that Mardochai's command to Esther to keep her Jewish origin a secret, points the way for the development of the action, he added: "Das sollte den Knotenpunkt des ganzen Dramas bilden, in welchem ich Ideen von Staatsreligion und Duldung aussprechen wollte, die mich hauptsächlich auf diesen Stoff geführt hatten, und die Religion und nicht die Liebe sollte den Inhalt dieses Dramas ausmachen, ja die letztere nur den Knoten in schöner Weise schürzen."⁸⁵

As one of the reasons for his failure to complete the fragment Grillparzer gave the marriage of Erzherzog Karl to the Protestant Princess Henriette, the daughter of the Duke of Nassau-Weilburg. This marriage, he said, caused so much talk in Viennese circles about religious freedom and tolerance that the police were more alert than ever. He, therefore, did not care to finish a work whose existence he would have had to keep secret, since the police would

⁸³ Robert Zimmermann, "Aus Gesprächen mit Grillparzer," *Jhb.* IV, p. 344.

⁸⁴ Auguste Littrow-Bischoff, *Aus dem persönlichen Verkehr mit Franz Grillparzer*, p. 155.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

not have approved of it. This secrecy was contrary to his nature and so he preferred to leave the fragment as it was.⁸⁶ His previous experiences with the police, who even raided his house in 1826, may have influenced his decision. Since, however, Princess Henriette died in 1829, his reference to her marriage would indicate an interest in the Esther material many years before the 1837 date of the actual writing of the fragment. The religious problem connected with her marriage may well have stimulated him to bring up the matter of tolerance in this drama. After having done so, or having decided to do so, he changed his mind because of the existing severe censorship which he did not want to antagonize unduly. As we shall see later, he gave a similar reason to Frankl.

Auguste Littrow-Bischoff further quotes Grillparzer as saying that he planned to have a big scene in which the rights of the State versus the Church were to be discussed. He intended to bring up the question of religious freedom, political rights, the position of the Church within the State, and the question of Church dogma. "Das ist gleich so ein Punkt gewesen, der mir alle Lust zur weitem Arbeit nahm; denn das hätte damals unter keiner Bedingung gespielt, vielleicht—ja ganz gewiss—nicht einmal gedruckt werden können," he is quoted as saying.⁸⁷ He undoubtedly knew of the difficulties which Wertheimer had with the publication of his history of the Austrian Jews and of the prejudice which Mosenthal encountered before *Deborah* was produced.⁸⁸ One can well believe Grillparzer when he stated that the scene dealing with religion robbed him of all desire to go on.

It is interesting to note that the very elements which Grillparzer intended to treat in the scene referred to, were almost identical with the provisions of the liberal laws of 1868, on which he voted but a very short time before his discussion with Littrow-Bischoff. This coincidence has been overlooked entirely by all commentators of the Esther problem. Yet, it is very important to the solution of this problem. It suggests the possibility that the aged Grillparzer may have been reciting the provisions of these laws, which

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 161.

⁸⁸ *Ante*, pp. 25 and 33f.

must have occupied his attention at the time, since he had himself carried up the stairs of the House of Lords just to vote for them, or that his preoccupation with the provisions of these laws may have brought to his mind his erstwhile plans regarding *Esther*. The second of these possibilities is the more likely in view of the statement to a number of people that the political and religious angles of the plot kept him from completing the fragment. It is, however, doubtful whether Grillparzer ever intended to make a drama of tolerance out of it, such as *Nathan der Weise*, as Lessing believes.⁸⁹ His known aversion to "das Tendenziöse" seems to preclude any such possibility. His criticism of Frankl's *Primator* and of Mosenthal's *Deborah* indicates his opinion of *Tendenzdramen*, so that it is doubtful whether he would have ignored his own advice to them.⁹⁰ He probably intended to bring up the religious question, as is indicated by his statement that Haman was to tell the king that religious differences are detrimental to the best interests of the state, but he would not have made a direct plea for religious tolerance.⁹¹

Among the other things he mentioned to Littrow-Bischoff were the liberties he took with the biblical version. Instead of the gallows which, he felt, were too barbaric, he substituted the surrender of all the holy books and the suppression of their "Cultus" as a fit punishment for the Jews. This he considered much more in keeping with modern times, and may even have had contemporary conditions in Vienna in mind. We have seen Sedlnitzky's report on the petition for a new synagogue and its stress of the need to prescribe the expansion and modernization of Jewish life and worship. According to the Littrow-Bischoff report, Mardochai commands Esther to intercede for her people whose misery is intolerable, and to plead their cause with the king. This Esther refuses to do for fear of losing his love. Having won his love by suppressing the truth of her origin and having learned to care for the king deeply, she is unwilling to jeopardize her happiness by an admission of deception. "Das sollte wieder eine wichtige Scene werden, in welcher die ganze Gewalt und Autorität talmudischen

⁸⁹ O. E. Lessing, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

⁹⁰ *Ante*, pp. 20 and 33.

⁹¹ Littrow-Bischoff, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

Priester- und Rabbinerthums sich geltend machen konnte, durch welche die rebellische und gottesläugnerische Tochter von der Hoffart der Welt zur Unterwerfung und zum Gehorsam unter die Herrschaft des Glaubens gebracht wurde," he is quoted as saying.⁹² When he was asked about the fate of Esther, Grillparzer remarked that she was to die just like Haman and Zares or that she was to lead a miserable life after having degenerated into a canaille. She would take over Haman's task of humoring the king's whims. Having lost Mardochai's support, either because of his old age or his death, she was to have a difficult time trying to ward off the constantly threatening moods of the volatile despot.⁹³ When his guest expressed her surprise that the lovely Esther of the first scenes was to degenerate thus, Grillparzer pointed out that she had consented in the very beginning to a lie by hiding her religion. This initial deception was to be the seed of her ultimate destruction. Having become queen through a lie, she is faced with the impossibility of maintaining her innocence and integrity from the start. Concerning the other incidents surrounding the plot, Grillparzer stated that he had forgotten them.⁹⁴

In the same year that he spoke to Littrow-Bischoff about *Esther*, he also discussed the fragment with Frankl, who had seen the staging of it and told Grillparzer of his admiration for it. According to Frankl, Grillparzer told him that he did not finish the fragment which he also liked, because he was distracted by the children of his hosts in Döbling where he spent the summer. By a process of elimination Hradek has established that Grillparzer spent the summer of 1840 there.⁹⁵ Grillparzer told Frankl that the children used to bang at his door every morning until he let them come in. They were so jolly and noisy that their visits robbed him of the necessary mood. Thus, he did not complete the fragment. "Wohl auch weil die Handlung mir politisch auszuarten drohte," he added.⁹⁶ This is in accord with his words to Littrow-Bischoff.

Pollhammer quotes Grillparzer as saying that he tried to resume

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁹⁵ *Studien zu Grillparzers Altersstil und die Datierung des Estherfragments*, pp. 202f.

⁹⁶ *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzers*, p. 31.

his work on *Esther* after a lapse of thirty years and found himself unable to do so.⁹⁷ Laube, too, claims that Grillparzer had forgotten the plot.⁹⁸ As a final proof of the fact that Grillparzer had really forgotten it, we have his own words in a letter of February 18, 1871 to King Ludwig II who had urged him to finish the fragment. "Ja, mein Herr," he wrote, "dieses Fragment rührt aus früherer Zeit her; ich weiss nicht mehr wodurch unterbrochen, und manches aus der ursprünglich klaren Folge ist mir gänzlich aus dem Gedächtnisse entschwunden."⁹⁹ Since this letter was written three years after the conversation with Littrow-Bischoff, it does not prove that he could not have remembered it then.

How can one reconcile the various statements and explanations made by Grillparzer regarding *Esther*? Sauer feels that in view of the apparent contradictions between the Zimmermann and the Littrow-Bischoff versions, neither should be taken very seriously.¹⁰⁰ He adds that Esther's lie about her Jewish origin would be the "Knotenpunkt" of the drama, which is just what Littrow-Bischoff quotes Grillparzer as saying. Farinelli doubts that Grillparzer intended to turn the fine and admirable Esther into a canaille. He believes that he was tired of trying to remember the details of the long-forgotten plot and so he used the word canaille to terminate the conversation.¹⁰¹ Berger also does not attach much importance to the Littrow-Bischoff report because it is not given verbatim, and might, therefore, contain alterations of her own. Grillparzer most likely did not remember his original intentions himself, he believes.¹⁰² Berger is glad that the fragment was not completed because the ending would have had to be hard and diabolical, as is indicated by Esther's lie and the king's hope that he had found in her an honest and admirable person.¹⁰³ This opinion is in complete accord with the Littrow-Bischoff version in spite of Berger's belief that it is not dependable.

Reich is one of the critics who feels that Grillparzer's words to Zimmermann are credible. Grillparzer, he believes, told him what-

⁹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 88f.

⁹⁸ W. 1893 ed. I, p. 105.

⁹⁹ *Jhb.* XXXI, p. 152. "Kleine Beiträge." Cf. pp. 152-154 for the many attempts to finish the *Esther* fragment.

¹⁰⁰ W. I, 7, p. XXIX.

¹⁰¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 192.

¹⁰² *Dramatische Vorträge*, p. 172.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

ever he still remembered of the plot. Two years later, in talking to Littrow-Bischoff he made up a new plan in his attempt to satisfy the persistent questions of his guest.¹⁰⁴ This is indeed begging the question. Does it seem logical that the aged Grillparzer would sit there and spin out this detailed ending of a drama like *Esther* just to avoid disappointing a curious woman by admitting his inability to recall the plot? As a matter of fact, Grillparzer did admit to her that he could not remember any other details. Reich does not believe that Grillparzer would have given wrong or misleading information to Zimmermann or Laube when he said that he had forgotten the plot. Why then, would he think up a whole plan just for Littrow-Bischoff? It is much more logical to assume that Grillparzer did not try to mislead anybody. In spite of the obvious contradictions in the various statements attributed to him, he was sincere in all of them. When he told Zimmermann that *Esther* was to follow the biblical version or that nobody was doomed except Haman, he did not remember the plot and did not take any pains to recollect his original intentions. His distraction during the conversation with Zimmermann is obvious. Grillparzer says "Ja, ja" repeatedly as though in agreement with something spoken by Zimmermann. It seems almost as though Grillparzer were just being very polite and not particularly interested.

Two years later in talking to Littrow-Bischoff, he seems to have made an effort to solve some of the problems connected with the fragment. The fact that *Esther* had been staged, as well as the fact that he was preoccupied with the provisions of the laws of 1868, may well have stimulated his memory. Because he told others that he did not remember the plot, it does not preclude the possibility of a successful attempt to remind himself of part of it. It is obvious that Grillparzer did not have a very clear idea of the way he intended to end the fragment. Even in the conversation with Littrow-Bischoff he was not sure whether *Esther* was to die or continue a miserable existence as a canaille.

Grillparzer's attempt to supply the ending for *Esther* is, on the whole, compatible with the few scenes which he actually wrote. Although he is not quoted verbatim by Littrow-Bischoff, her re-

¹⁰⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 220.

port is credible. It seems logical that Esther's initial lie should lead to further complications. It is also logical to assume that Grillparzer may have lost all desire to complete the fragment because of its political and religious aspects. His use of the word *canaille* is what has influenced most critics to disregard the entire report. There is, of course, the possibility that Grillparzer did not use this very term. That he would have had a difficult time making Esther into a *canaille* after having portrayed her as a noble and intelligent person in the early scenes, is evident. He may well have been aware of this difficulty and may for that reason, among others, have lost all desire to finish the fragment. We can readily understand any reluctance on his part to turn the lovely girl into a woman hardened by lies and intrigues. Since Grillparzer could hardly have been interested in creating another drama which followed the biblical outline, he must have been more concerned with the conflict arising in the soul of a person like Esther who won the man she learned to love and honor by means of a lie, and who subsequently found herself between the Scylla of her duty to her oppressed people and the Charybdis of her loyalty to her husband. To confess her deception would mean to rob Ahasverus of his faith in her and of his newly acquired will to live.

In addition to accepting the Littrow-Bischoff report, we may also regard Grillparzer's statement to Frankl as a reasonable explanation for his failure to complete the fragment. His words to Laube and Pollhammer about having forgotten the plot, as well as Frankl's opinion to the same effect, do not necessarily contradict the Littrow-Bischoff discussion.¹⁰⁵ Küchler's attempt to reconcile the contradictory versions of Zimmermann and Littrow-Bischoff by regarding them as the two poles between which Grillparzer oscillated in his search for a satisfactory ending, is not to be taken seriously.¹⁰⁶

In his attempt to complete the Grillparzer fragment, Krauss has Mardochai warn Esther of a plot to poison the king. Haman informs the king that the Jews are responsible for this, whereupon he orders all the Jews killed. In order to save her people Esther confesses her origin and also exposes Haman's intrigues. After

¹⁰⁵ Frankl, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

¹⁰⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 349.

beheading Haman and staying the order to kill the Jews the king lives happily with Esther. He also rewards Mardochai.¹⁰⁷ A similar ending has occurred to Berthold Auerbach who made the following comment after seeing *Esther* on the stage in 1875: "Zur tragischen Lösung scheint das Drama nicht angelegt; es ist möglich, die Schlusswendung dahin zu richten, dass Ahasverus, von der Gattin aus Davids Stamme veranlasst, die Juden aus dem Exil heimsendet nach Kanaan. Und es lässt sich eine sehr wirk-same Situation und Scene denken, wie Mardochai an ihrer Spitze abzieht und die Nichte auf dem Throne zurücklässt."¹⁰⁸ Neither of the two endings given above seems to be in keeping with Grillparzer's original intention. While these endings might be called wishful thinking on the part of Jews, they are not the ones which Grillparzer would have given his drama. A dramatist of his rank does not stress the king's lack of faith in human nature and then his regained confidence after his meeting with Esther, nor does he stress her deception without making important use of those two facts in the development of the action. These elements point the way to a tragic conflict, and justify his interest in the Esther story.

In analyzing Grillparzer's treatment of the Jewish characters in *Esther* we must limit ourselves to the fragment, even though its most important character does not appear much in the two acts. Any subsequent attempts to complete this fragment, as well as any statements made by Grillparzer concerning *Esther*, must be left out of consideration entirely, particularly in view of the contradictory nature of these remarks.

The Esther of the fragment is a calm, intelligent and self-possessed girl who has the courage of her convictions. She does not share her uncle's lofty conception of the great mission of the Jews. Willing to admit the glory of her people, she feels, nevertheless, that it would be better if the Jews were less aware of it, and others more. She believes

„Die eigne Schätzung ist ein schlimmer Massstab.“¹⁰⁹

Whereas her uncle spends his days and nights poring over ancient books and pondering over the lost glory of the Jews, she lives in the

¹⁰⁷ *Esther*, Grillparzers Drama ergänzt, Stuttgart, 1903.

¹⁰⁸ *Dramatische Eindrücke*, p. 184. ¹⁰⁹ W. I, 7, p. 128.

present. There is no sense in reading dumb symbols, she feels, when there is so much to be seen and heard. Being a realist, she is well aware of the subjugation of the Jews and the intolerance concerning them. Thus, when Mardochai mentions the possibility of her being called to court and chosen queen, she disabuses him almost sarcastically, by saying:

„Sei ruhig, uns beschützt schon unsre Abkunft,
Denn Israel, so hoch in eigner Schätzung,
Steht tief im Wert bei allem Nachbarvolk;
Man reicht nicht gern der Jüdin Hand und Ring.“¹¹⁰

Esther's words do not still Mardochai's fear that she might be chosen by the despot. While pondering over this possibility, he suddenly perceives the king's search for the most beautiful girl in his kingdom as a means chosen by God to save the Jewish people. Rationalizing about it, he convinces himself that the salvation of the Jews would not come through bloodshed, but through the good will of the king in love with a beautiful Jewess. Why not his Esther? Could she not be a second Rahel or Judith? Knowing that the Jews are not a fighting people and that their numbers are small, he convinces himself in no time that their salvation is to be obtained by means of cunning and, if necessary, deception. He is so eager to make his niece the savior of her people that he stoops to petty scheming, unworthy of his proud and independent self. In order not to spoil her chance to become queen, he counsels Esther to keep her Jewish origin secret. It is this advice which is destined later to destroy the harmony of her being and cause her great suffering. Regarding it Ilse Münch states: "Die Tragik, die in diesem Abfall von ihrer reinen Natur und ihrem ganzen bisherigen Dasein liegt, liess sich nicht mehr beiseite schaffen. Wenn sich auch nichts mehr in ihrem äussern Schicksal ändern sollte, so wäre doch eine stete Trauer um das unwiederbringlich Verlorene ihr Los. Das Entscheidende ist hier die *innere Tragödie*; das Herabsinken eines wertvollen Menschen von der Höhe unbefleckter ethischer Reinheit."¹¹¹ This is undoubtedly what interested Grillparzer in the entire Esther story. His ill-chosen use of

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

¹¹¹ *Die Tragik im Drama und Persönlichkeit Franz Grillparzers*, pp. 82f.

the word *canaille* was meant by him to indicate this degeneration of Esther. That the development of her character would have taken a downward course is safe to assume from her consent to the deception and her generally dangerous position in the intrigue-infested court of Ahasverus.

Esther is too proud and independent to become a willing tool of Mardochai. When she hears of the king's search for a beautiful girl, she resents the fact that he has the power to dispose of her life, regardless of her personal feelings in the matter. Being a woman and being aware of her own beauty, she also resents the fact that her origin should be sufficient ground to rob her of the chance to become queen. She does not, however, want this honor and is ready to tell the messenger of the king that she is a Jewess in order to disqualify herself, but she is hurt by the prejudice against her race, nevertheless. When the messenger assures her that he had been ordered to bring all the beautiful girls to court regardless of race or creed, she does not mention her origin. Thus, much against her personal inclination, yet prompted, at the same time, by a very natural curiosity to see the Oriental despot, Esther comes to the court of Ahasverus.

When she meets the king she is devoid of all desire to find favor in his eyes. She is, therefore, straightforward and frank. The disillusioned Ahasverus, used to the fawning hypocrites of his court, and despairing of human nature, is shocked by the fearless words of Esther, when she says to him:

„Willst du Vertraun, und hast es nicht? suchst Neigung
Und hegst Verdacht? O armer, armer Fürst!
Das Edle, Hohe kauft sich nicht, man tauscht es
Und man erhält so viel nur, als man gibt.“¹¹²

Her advice to take Vasthi back surprises him. Her own lack of ambition is something new to him, who is constantly surrounded by people seeking personal advantage. He knows too much of treachery and deceit not to be impressed by her wisdom and sincerity. It is not surprising that he falls in love with her. No human being had ever spoken so freely and honestly to him as this young girl. He feels that he has at last found somebody in whom he can have

¹¹² W. I, 7, p. 143.

complete confidence. Thus, without intending to, Esther wins the king's love and admiration because she has the courage to speak as she feels.

The scene between the king and Esther is the finest and most beautifully written in the entire fragment. Grillparzer has succeeded in depicting two people who, forgetting the disparity of rank and station, try to help and understand one another. Although the scene as a whole is regarded by all critics as a fine example of Grillparzer's genius, Esther's mature wisdom has been found to be too profound for such a young girl. Laube feels that no girl, no matter how brilliant, could speak as wisely as Esther; that it is really Grillparzer himself who is expressing these thoughts. He makes the general observation that Grillparzer's figures frequently do not speak in accordance with their characters, but rather with his own views.¹¹³ If this be so, then Grillparzer has expressed his own attitude toward the Jews in the words of Alphons and the two Esthers.

Regarding Esther's precocity, Betty Paoli, who might herself have served as an inspiration to Grillparzer's creation of either one of the Esthers, admits that she impresses one at first glance as having too much wisdom and too great a knowledge of the world and of people. She adds, however, that there are certain types of intellects that develop ahead of their chronological age. In view of her own Jewish origin and of her close association with Grillparzer, her justification of Esther's precocious personality is well worth quoting. "Sie ist eine Jüdin, die Tochter eines geknechteten, unterdrückten Volkes, dessen Los es Jahrtausende hindurch war, sich mit den Waffen des Geistes der brutalen Gewalt zu erwehren, von der es sich bedrängt sah. Man braucht sich nicht zur Lehre Darwins zu bekennen, um anzunehmen, dass unter solchen Verhältnissen eine starke Ausbildung des Verstandes zur Stammeseigenschaft werden muss. In wohlthuender Ruhe und Klarheit steht Esther vor uns, durch ihren Instinkt zum Denken genöthigt wie andere zum Athmen, starker Empfindungen fähig, ihrer aber auch mächtig, ein Individuum und zugleich ein natio-

¹¹³ Franz Grillparzers *Lebensgeschichte*, p. 173.

nalcr Typus."¹¹⁴ Whether or not one agrees with Betty Paoli that Esther represents the typical Jewess, one must admit that her wise words are conditioned by her Jewish heritage, as well as by her association with the learned and proud Mardochai.

Having learned to love Ahasverus, Esther becomes indifferent to everything else. Her duty to her people is relegated to the background. In this she resembles Hero whose love for Leander makes her oblivious of her duties as a priestess. Esther's sole concern is her happiness to which she feels herself entitled. She is primarily a woman in love, and not a Jewess bent on saving her oppressed co-religionists. An admission on her part that she deliberately suppressed her origin would definitely jeopardize her happiness, she knows. That she might even resort to intrigue to safeguard this happiness is not illogical to assume. Whether Grillparzer would have been able to motivate her complete degeneration into a canaille is, of course, purely a matter of conjecture. As she is depicted in the fragment she is one of the most perfect feminine characters that Grillparzer has created. It is in her, more than in the other admirable Jewish characters, that Grillparzer has indicated an appreciation of the Jewish type at its best, just as he has shown that type at its worst in Isaak.

In the character of Mardochai, Grillparzer has created an individual as different from Isaak as day is from night. Instead of the usurer, the coward, and the crass materialist concerned exclusively with the acquisition of money, we see the scholar, the dreamer, the proud Jew who lives in a world of books and ideas. He is as dignified and fearless as Isaak is the very opposite. Mardochai is ever ready to proclaim the great mission of the Jews, and is even willing to die so that the past glory of Israel may come to life again. Esther's tendency to mock at the self-appreciation of the Jews hurts him not a little.

„Ja, unser Volk, es ward von Gott bestimmt,
Zu sein der Gipfel dieser weiten Erde,
Der Mittelpunkt der Völker nah und fern,"¹¹⁵

he assures Esther.

¹¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 54f.

¹¹⁵ W. I, 7. p. 127

When he advises his niece to hide her origin, he is motivated by a desire to save his people, and not by any personal considerations. He does not regard Esther as an individual who has a right to happiness. She must be willing to sacrifice everything for the welfare of the Jews. He shares Grillparzer's belief that the individual and his personal inclinations are of no importance where the common good is involved. If Esther could bring about the rebuilding of Solomon's temple, Mardochai would feel no qualms that she attained her position by means of a subterfuge. On the contrary,

„Dann wollt' ich segnen, dass, halb Zorn, halb List,
Ich ihr verbot, Geschlecht und Stamm zu nennen.
Wenn sie dann säss' an ihres Herren Seite,
Dann träte ich hin und sagte: Fürst der Heiden,
Die Gattin, die du liebst, sie ist die Unsre.
Verstoss sie, wenn du kannst. Ich bin ihr Ohm,“¹¹⁶

he says.

Whereas Grillparzer's Esther is a much more determined individual than Lope de Vega's, and possesses many original traits, his Mardochai has the major characteristics of his literary predecessor. In both dramas, he is the direct opposite of Haman on whom Grillparzer heaped all the suppressed contempt he had for the petty and corrupt officials of his own day. What Haman attains by means of treachery and intrigue, Mardochai achieves by his cleverness, energy, pride, and firmness, according to Farinelli.¹¹⁷ His courage is most discernible in his contact with Haman. When the latter tells him that anyone incurring his displeasure is doomed, Mardochai answers calmly:

„Nun, Ihr gefällt mir nicht, seht, und ich lebe.“¹¹⁸

When he continues to read his book and to ignore the mighty and enraged Haman, he elicits the following observation from Haman who is as unused to being treated with contempt, openly at least, as Ahasverus is, to being treated with frankness and honesty:

„Das scheint mir etwa einer von den Geistern,
Den starken, die die Welt und uns verschmähn.
Wohl ein Braman, vielleicht ein Jude gar.“¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹¹⁸ W. I, 7, p. 158.

¹¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

Mardochai resembles Lessing's Nathan who stressed the fact that a person is a human being first and then a Jew or a Christian. In his plea for understanding and tolerance Nathan says to the Templar:

„Ah! wenn ich einen mehr in Euch
Gefunden hätte, dem es gnügt, ein Mensch
Zu heissen!“¹²⁰

When Haman asks Mardochai his name he answers simply:

„Ich heisse Mensch und bin's.“¹²¹

He also shares with Nathan his devotion to the faith of his forefathers, his humanity and loyalty to his people. A fondness for dialectics and an independence of spirit are similar traits in both. It is quite possible, in view of Grillparzer's admiration for *Nathan der Weise*, that Mardochai's character was directly influenced by Nathan. Whether *Esther* would have been a drama of tolerance in the spirit of the Lessing work is a moot question; that it would have been an unbiased and liberal treatment of the Jewish story is safe to assume. It is certainly an interesting coincidence that the fragment was staged a few days after the passing of the liberal laws of 1868 which completed the emancipation of the Jews.

C. Poems and Epigrams

Grillparzer has written a number of poems and epigrams to and about Jews. The poems are usually a tribute to some particular Jew, the epigrams invariably a bitter comment on Jews collectively. His Saphir epigrams we have examined elsewhere in these pages. Their venomous tone was motivated, as we have seen, by something more concrete than the mere fact that Saphir was, or had been a Jew.

In addition to the poems mentioned in connection with his contacts with individual Jews, Grillparzer wrote poems to Moscheles, to the Countess Wimpfen, née Eskeles, to the Baroness Pereira, to Flora Fries, and to the Baron Todesco.¹²² These poems were written over a period of almost fifty years, beginning in the 'twenties

¹²⁰ G. E. Lessing, *Nathan der Weise, Sämtliche Schriften*, Lachmann-Muncker ed., III, p. 63. [Stuttgart, 1887.]

¹²¹ W. I, 7, p. 160.

¹²² W. 1803 ed., III, pp. 35, 36, 45, 47, 51, 101, and *passim*.

when he first came into direct contact with many Jews, and extending to the last years of his life. In 1869 he wrote a poem to his disciple Mosenthal, after the latter's *Isabella Orsini* had been produced.

„Und wäre wahr der Kritiken jede,
Dein Werk hat mich dennoch gefreut,
Schon als eine gebildete Rede
In einer roh gewordenen Zeit,“¹²³

he wrote. Although these poems are not indicative of Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews, they are additional proof of his friendly relationship with them.

Grillparzer's epigrams, on the other hand, are definite, outspoken, and very expressive indications of his feelings. They are, as a whole, decidedly antagonistic in tone. By far the most pointed of his epigrams were written about Saphir. The others, varying in tone from irony to hatred in increasing intensity, were written years apart. The earliest of these was written in 1816 to an unknown *Finanzreformer*:

„A. Das soll der neue Heiland sein?
Das redet man mir nimmer ein!
B. Und doch gewinnt es so den Schein,
Sieh nur, wie sich die Juden freu'n!“¹²⁴

As the years passed and Grillparzer became more and more disappointed with his lot, he wrote the following sardonic epigram in 1851:

„Warum bin ich nicht ein Bauer,
Warum bin ich nicht ein Jud'!
Es käme von Oestreichs Reformen
Mir wenigstens etwas zu gut.“¹²⁵

He shows here an awareness of the improvement of the general life of the Jew, not necessarily any resentment or envy. On the basis of the next two epigrams, which have so far remained undated, Wolbe concluded that Grillparzer did not like converted Jews.¹²⁶ In view of his friendly attitude toward a number of converted Jews, including Heine, Börne, Weilen, Neuwall, etc., this seems a strange conclusion.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

¹²⁴ W. 1803 ed., III, p. 88.

¹²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

„Es steht ein Christ an der Himmelspforte,
Sankt Peter lässt ihn nicht ein;
Es stürmt just eine Kohorte
Getaufte Juden hinein.“¹²⁷

„Etwa erwählt ist dein Geschlecht,
Trotz Börsenspiel und Trödelbuden;
Altgläubige sind mir ganz recht,
Nicht aber die getauften Juden.“¹²⁸

Only the second of these really indicates any antagonism. The first one might even be taken humorously. Although he does say that he dislikes converted Jews, he admits that he finds the orthodox ones acceptable. In his own life, however, he associated primarily with Jews who had broken away from the orthodox beliefs of their fathers, and assimilated in accordance with the advice of Joseph II.

It is quite possible that Grillparzer may have written the following epigram after the fiasco of *Weh dem, der lügt*, although neither the date nor the stimulus is definitely known.

„In gebildeten Ländern und in rohen und kruden
Bekämpft sich verschiednes mit Macht und mit Listen,
In rohen verfolgen die Christen die Juden,
In feinen dagegen die Juden die Christen.“¹²⁹

Grillparzer may well have considered himself the victim of oppression by the Jews after Saphir's public mockery of his comedy. The last and most definitely anti-Jewish epigram is the following one, dated by Sauer as of 1865 and referring to the emancipation of the Jews. Although the particular provocation for it is unknown, it is most likely prompted by some incident which aroused his ire.

„Spät ward man billig eurem Geschlechte,
Das Hass und Rachsucht mit Schmach beluden,
Ihr habt nun alle Bürgerrechte,
Nur freilich bleibt ihr immer Juden.“¹³⁰

Before evaluating these epigrams as indications of Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews, one should remember that they were written on the spur of the moment, frequently as a result of a

¹²⁷ W. 1893 ed., III, p. 240.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ W. I, 10, p. 256.

temporary vexation. They are not an objective, calmly rationalized expression of his feelings. As Volkelt points out correctly: "Für Grillparzers satirische Gedichte ist charakteristisch, dass Aerger, Kränkung, Erbitterung noch unmittelbar gegenwärtig sind, sich heftig und unabgeschwächt geltend machen, dass diese Affekte kein halb Überwundenes, im Gemüte schon Zurückliegendes und objektiv Gewordenes bilden."¹³¹ There is no doubt that Grillparzer wrote most of his epigrams while in the throes of a momentary pique. To him they were an emotional outlet, a safety valve by means of which he was able to express his feelings about people or things which hurt or vexed him in any way. In judging their value as direct evidence of his hostility toward the Jews, one should bear in mind that they are only part of his expressions regarding them. They are by no means conclusive proof of any anti-Semitism on Grillparzer's part, but rather a manifestation of his characteristic inconsistency. One should not lose sight of his many friendships with Jews throughout this long life, nor should one disregard the two Esthers, or Mardochai, who are well thought out characters depicting good Jewish traits, rather than hastily written expressions of momentary annoyances.

¹³¹ "Grillparzer als Dichter des Komischen," *Jhb.* XV, p. 21.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

In spite of the wealth of Grillparzer material, no attempt has been made to ascertain how he felt about the Jews, although there are many studies of *Die Jüdin von Toledo* and *Esther*. The few critics who touch upon the question at all base their conclusions on only part of the evidence, and are, as a whole, in complete disagreement with one another. Thus, on the basis of Isaak's character and the few antagonistic epigrams which Grillparzer has written, some critics have decided that Grillparzer was anti-Semitic. On the basis of his friendship with certain Jews, his creation of the two admirable Esthers, and the utterances of Alphons, others have decided that he was tolerant of the Jews.

According to Ehrhard, Grillparzer did not like the Jews and depicted their bad traits in Isaak. In his subsequent admission, that he showed their fine qualities in the character of Esther, Ehrhard obviously weakens his original statement.¹ In discussing the fragment, Ehrhard points out that Esther's question whether she has to lie, betray, and kill in order to be worthy of her race, shows Grillparzer's secret aversion to the Jews. He adds, however, "Nicht jener Antisemitismus, der Oesterreich später so tief verwirrte, und den der in toleranter Gesinnung erzogene Grillparzer verurteilt hätte; vielmehr ist seine Abneigung die Reaktion gegen die christliche Lehre, dass ein Stamm von Ewigkeit her auserwählt sei, einem Heiland das Leben zu geben."² Does Esther's question really imply any personal view of Grillparzer? Or is it more in keeping with her realistic and sceptical nature? When she asks her uncle whether she has to kill and betray she is merely referring to Deborah and Judith mentioned by Mardochai. Not sharing his views of the great mission of the Jews, and wishing that they were less certain of their own worth, she cannot picture herself as the avenger and savior of her people. Esther is too much a creature of reason to be able to develop the emotional frenzy of a Judith or

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 394; cf. also *Ante*, p. 94.

² *Ibid.*, p. 366.

a Deborah. Her question is an attempt on her part to bring her fanatical uncle back to his senses and does not necessarily betray any personal conviction on Grillparzer's part that a Jew has to lie, betray, or kill to win the admiration of his fellow Jews.

It is interesting to read what Frankl, the quondam secretary of the Jewish *Cultusgemeinde* and the good friend of Grillparzer, has to say regarding Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews. After pointing out that he twice made use of Jewish material in his dramas, he adds: "Wenn auch dieser Umstand nicht wäre, dürfen die den Juden Feindseligen ihn doch nicht zu den Ihren zählen. Er kannte ihre Fehler, doch auch ihre Tugenden, und eine gute Zahl ihrer zählte er zu seinen Bewunderern und Freunden."³ He makes the above statement after quoting two of Grillparzer's most antagonistic epigrams about Jews, so that there can be no question of his knowledge of them. Surely, a man like Frankl, who was in such close contact with Grillparzer, was more in a position to judge his views, than have been certain critics who based their opinions on a few epigrams and the character of Isaak. As Frankl states correctly, Grillparzer was undoubtedly aware of the failings of the Jews, but so is any clear thinking and realistic Jew. His mere awareness of their bad qualities did not necessarily make him impervious to their good ones, which he depicted in the two Esthers.

Although believing that the words spoken by Alphons concerning the crippling of the Jews, express most likely Grillparzer's own views, Reich states the following with reference to the possible plea for tolerance in *Esther*: "Toleranz bedeutete für Grillparzer gewiss keine einseitige Verherrlichung des ihm eher unsympathischen Judenthums, dessen Schwächen er ebenso wohl kannte wie seine Vorzüge."⁴ If Laube's contention that Grillparzer frequently expressed his own views through his characters is correct, and it probably is, then Grillparzer did feel that the Christians made the Jews limp and then blamed them for it.⁵ One has but to read the history of the Jews in Vienna, not to mention of the world, to see the process by which the Jew was crippled.

³ "Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzers," p. 10.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 245 and 236.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 173.

Kleinberg is another of the critics who sees Grillparzer's views in the words of Alphons. He also points out that his contact with certain Jews, such as Frankl, Jeitteles, the Lieben sisters, and Frau Pereira, had made him respect these people, adding: ". . . im allgemeinen aber fühlte er sich ihnen aus uneingestandenem Rasseninstinkt heraus wesensfremd. . . ." ⁶ Grillparzer's unfortunate experiences with Saphir and his ilk may have conditioned his attitude toward the Jews, Kleinberg feels, adding (in a footnote, however,) that neither Isaak nor Esther are to be regarded as symbolic expressions of Grillparzer's conception of the Jew. "Die beiden sind künstlerisch abgetönte Figuren einer Dichtung," he states.⁷ It is interesting to note that Kleinberg is the only one of the critics who expresses this view. That he is correct in his opinion should be obvious from the material presented in the preceding pages. If Isaak and Esther indicate Grillparzer's conception of the Jews, they prove nothing. Either Grillparzer hated them and portrayed their worst side in Isaak, or he liked them and depicted their good qualities in Esther and in the two characters of the fragment. He could not have liked and disliked them at the same time.

Wolbe, as we have seen, states that Grillparzer had many friends among the Jews, but that he did not like the converted ones.⁸ While the first part of this statement is justified on the basis of his previously analyzed Jewish contacts, the second, based on Grillparzer's two epigrams about converted Jews, is built on too weak a premise, particularly if we bear in mind his opinion of Weilen and Börne. Trabert merely absolves Grillparzer from any bias concerning the Jews, and Lublinsky, who has written a lengthy article about Grillparzer's Jewish characters, completely disregards the question of his attitude toward the Jews.⁹

In his attempt to rationalize Grillparzer's feelings about Jews, Mahrenholtz states: "Grillparzer, der von sich selbst sagt, er müsse, obwohl friedfertigen Sinnes, stets sich einen Feind schaffen, auf den er allen Groll ablade, war unvorsichtig genug,

⁶ *Franz Grillparzer*, p. 114 footnote.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 204. Samuel Lublinsky, "Jüdische Charaktere bei Grillparzer, Hebbel und Ludwig," *Lit. Studien*, Berlin, 1899.

den schreibfertigen, in seiner Polemik wenig rücksichtsvollen Journalisten ohne dringende Veranlassung anzugreifen."¹⁰ He then adds that his experiences with Saphir, and his clique of converted and unconverted Jews were the cause of Grillparzer's anti-Semitism which, he believes, is surprising in a man devoted to the liberal principles of Joseph II. As proof of this anti-Semitic attitude, Mahrenholtz presents the character of Isaak and the few antagonistic epigrams, qualifying his opinion, however, with the following: "Diese Abneigung gegen das 'erwählte Geschlecht' beschränkte sich, wie bei jedem hochgebildeten, human denkenden Manne, natürlich auf die Auswüchse des versprengten Volkes, auf die Börsenschacherer und litterarischen Industrieritter. Mit namhaften jüdischen Schriftstellern, wie Börne, Heine, Frankl und andern, verkehrte er in freundschaftlicher Weise, und von jüdischen Literaten ging auch die Anregung zu dem Kultus des halbvergessenen Dichters aus."¹¹ By stating that Grillparzer's dislike for the Jews was limited to usurers and swindlers, Mahrenholtz is *ipso facto* contradicting his own statement that Grillparzer was anti-Semitic. His hatred of such people is justified. There are surely many Jews who feel an even stronger contempt for the "Auswüchse" of their own people than Grillparzer. That he had friendly associations with many Jews of a different type is conceded by Mahrenholtz, who thus establishes Grillparzer's liberal attitude, which is in keeping with his Josephinism.

Having examined the various critical opinions concerning Grillparzer's views about the Jews and having shown that no critic took all the material into consideration, we are ready to recapitulate what all the material presented in the preceding pages, proves. Grillparzer's attitude toward the Jews was definitely conditioned by his *Weltanschauung*, and shows the same dualism and inconsistency apparent in his personality. This inconsistency accounts for the critical disagreement about his attitude toward the Jews, toward religion, and toward life. Only on the basis of this same inconsistency can one reconcile his definitely liberal view regarding individual Jews, and his occasionally antagonistic attitude toward them collectively.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 94f.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

The first and most important consideration is not so much what Grillparzer wrote about Jews as what he actually felt about them in his many associations with them throughout his long life. It is much easier to profess a liberal attitude than it is to put it into practice. In every contact which Grillparzer has had with individual Jews, he has shown his tolerance and his indifference to the fact that they were Jews. In discussing them collectively, however, he frequently betrayed some bias. This is very natural for a man of his temperament. As a liberal and *Josefiner*, he was consciously tolerant and judged people solely on their own merit. As a patriotic Austrian whose racial heritage was steeped in anti-Semitism, he was subconsciously conditioned to hate Jews. This feeling was, however, relegated to the background of his being and came out only on very few occasions under the stress of extreme provocation. How rare these occasions were is indicated by the fact that there are only two anti-Semitic epigrams in his very large collection of epigrams. The paucity of his disparaging remarks about Jews collectively in his autobiography and diaries is further proof of his lack of racial bias. These very rare expressions of antagonism are nothing more than manifestations of his characteristic inconsistency. "Ich bin im Einzelnen inkonsequent, aber eisern konsequent im Ganzen," Grillparzer wrote about himself.¹² This certainly applies to his attitude toward the Jews.

As we have seen, most critics base their belief that Grillparzer disliked the Jews on the previously discussed epigrams and on his treatment of the character of Isaak. In the five Jewish characters which Grillparzer has created he has supplied us with sufficient contrast to make us feel that he was not concerned with expressing his personal attitude toward the Jews. He created his characters in accordance with the needs of the plot, being definitely influenced by literary precursors. When he makes Isaak speak the *Judenteutsch* of the ghetto, Grillparzer is merely being realistic, since a Jew of Isaak's type would probably speak that way. The fact that his daughters speak the same language as the Christians shows the influence of literary tradition. In the dramatic works preceding Grillparzer's era, the Jewess is always

¹² W. II, 8, p. 300.

depicted as very beautiful and sufficiently charming to arouse the passion of Christians. The Jew is always depicted as an old, ugly, and dirty miser. Rarely is a young Jew presented on the stage. Grillparzer's omission of Levi, Rahel's brother, may be another indication of his acceptance of literary tradition. The one deviation was, of course, Lessing who, in his efforts to treat the Jews with fairness and tolerance, frequently depicted them as the paragons of all virtues, as for instance, in his youthful play, *Die Juden*. Neither extreme is, of course, true to life.

In the oriental setting, Grillparzer has created the proud, scholarly, and humane Mardochai to whom the welfare of his oppressed people comes before any personal considerations, and the beautiful Esther, noble and admirable at all times. In this drama Grillparzer added his own fine details to the already drawn outlines of the Bible and Lope de Vega. In the Spanish setting, on the other hand, we have Isaak, Mardochai's direct opposite, an utterly contemptible creature. As a contrast to the volatile and shallow Rahel, we have Esther, her half-sister, and the Esther of the fragment. These five characters represent different facets of the Jewish personality and nothing more. If they are at all indicative of any personal view of Grillparzer, they prove his awareness of the good Jewish traits as well as the bad ones. Whereas the exigencies of the plot and the literary influences conditioned Isaak's bad character, Grillparzer has endowed the characters of the two Esthers and Mardochai with many admirably traits not dictated by the needs of the plot or by literary predecessors.

The mere fact that Grillparzer had the courage to write even a fragment of the Esther story in the 'thirties, when the censorship in Austria was becoming increasingly oppressive, is significant. He was obviously aware of the danger to which he exposed himself by his treatment of racial and political questions. The fact that he did not complete the fragment bears this out. This was, as we have seen, one of the reasons given by him to Frankl and to Littrow-Bischoff. His reading of books dealing with Jewish history, his comments on their religion, his visit to the ghetto, his early readings about the heroes of the Old Testament, his dra-

matic treatment of two Jewish stories, all attest to an interest in the Jews.

Moving in a liberal social and intellectual milieu, Grillparzer met all types of Jews, and being ahead of his times in his great admiration of the humanists, he shared their tolerant views about the Jews. Occasionally antagonistic toward them collectively, or toward individuals like Saphir, he was, as a whole, devoid of any racial bias. His few deviations from his general attitude of liberalism and tolerance were due to the constant inner struggle between opposing forces of his nature. The world in which he lived conformed neither to his intellectual Josephinism nor to his subconscious baroque, thus intensifying the unhappiness of his existence, as Alker points out.¹³ Without going into detail concerning the degree of baroque influence on Grillparzer's personality as propounded chiefly by Alker and Roselieb, we can state definitely that on the basis of his attitude toward the Jews, Grillparzer was a humanist who belongs with Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe in the history of thought. His humanism and rationalism were the two great forces of his inner life. In spite of the many disturbing inconsistencies, his *Weltanschauung* as a whole harked back to the classicists and conditioned his views. His attitude toward the Jews is compatible only with a humanistic interpretation of his *Weltanschauung*.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberti, Conrad, *Ludwig Börne*, Leipzig, 1886.
- Alker, Ernst, "Franz Grillparzer, ein Kampf um Leben und Kunst," *Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, Nr. 36, Marburg a. L., 1930.
- Aschner, S. "Zur Quellenfrage der *Jüdin von Toledo*," *Euphorion*, XIX, 1912.
- Auerbach, Berthold, *Dramatische Eindrücke*, 1893.
- Backmann, Reinhold, *Grillparzers Erwachen*, Festschrift August Sauer, Stuttgart, 1925.
- Backmann, Reinhold, "Grillparzer als Revolutionär," *Euphorion*, 32, 1931.
- Bauernfeld, Eduard von, *Erinnerungen aus Alt-Wien*, ed. by Josef Bindtner, Wien, 1923.
- Bauernfeld, Eduard von, "Gesammelte Aufsätze," *Schriften des Literarischen Vereins in Wien*, IV, Wien, 1905.
- Bauernfeld, Eduard von, *Aus Bauernfelds Tagebüchern*, ed. by Carl Glossy, Wien 1895.
- Bartels, Adolf, *Jüdische Herkunft und Literaturwissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1925.
- Bartels, Adolf, *Judentum und deutsche Literatur*, Leipzig, 1918.
- Bartels, Adolf, *Lessing und die Juden*, Dresden, 1918.
- Berger, Alfred von, *Dramaturgische Vorträge*, Wien, 1891.
- Beringer, Leonhard, "Grillparzers Persönlichkeit in seinem Werke," *Zürcher Schriften zur Literaturwissenschaft*, III, Horgen-Zürich-Leipzig, 1928.
- Beste, Konrad, *Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Politischen Tendenzliteratur seiner Zeit*, doct. diss., Wolfenbüttel, 1915.
- Bettelheim-Gabillon, Helene, "Zur Charakteristik Betty Paolis," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, X, pp. 190ff.
- Bogner, Wilhelm, "Tagebuch von der Reise nach Deutschland," in *Grillparzer's Sämtliche Werke*, Ausgabe der Stadt Wien, II, 11, pp. 145ff.
- Börne, Ludwig, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1829 I, 24/30, Hamburg, 1835.
- Braun, Hanns, *Grillparzers Verhältnis zu Shakespeare*, Nürnberg, 1916.
- Bücher, Wilhelm, "Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Politik," *Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, Nr. 19, Marburg, 1913.
- Bulthaupt, Heinrich, *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*, Bd. 3, Oldenburg und Leipzig, 1897-1902.
- Costenoble, *Aus dem Burgtheater*, 2 Bde., Wien, 1889.
- Dingelstedt, Franz, "Die Poesie in Oesterreich," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, IX, pp. 282ff.

- Duschinsky, W., "Über die Quellen und die Zeit der Abfassung von Grillparzers *Esther*," *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, 50, 1899.
- Ebner-Eschenbach, Marie von, *Meine Erinnerungen an Grillparzer*, Berlin, 1916.
- Ehrhard, August, *Franz Grillparzer, sein Leben und sein Werk*, transl. by Moritz Necker, München, 1910.
- Farinelli, Arturo, *Grillparzer und Lope de Vega*, Berlin, 1894.
- Fäulhammer, Adalbert, *Franz Grillparzer*, Graz, 1884.
- Foglar, Adolf, *Grillparzers Ansichten über Literatur, Bühne und Leben*, Stuttgart, 1891.
- Frankl, Ludwig August, *Erinnerungen*, Prag, 1910.
- Frankl, Ludwig August, *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzers*, Wien, Pest, Leipzig, 1884.
- Frankl, Ludwig August, *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien*, Wien, 1853.
- Freybe, Albert, *Der ethische Gehalt in Grillparzers Werken*, Gütersloh, 1893.
- Geiger, Ludwig, "Die Jüdin von Toledo," *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, 64, Nr. 2, Berlin, Jan. 26, 1900, pp. 45ff.
- Geiger, Ludwig, *Die deutsche Literatur und die Juden*, Berlin, 1910.
- Geissler, Horst, *Grillparzer und Schopenhauer*, Weimar, 1915.
- Glossy, Carl, "Aus dem Vormärz," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, X, pp. 312ff.
- Gomperz, Theodor, *Erinnerungen und Essays*, Stuttgart und Leipzig, 1905.
- Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, Vols. 1-33, Wien, 1891ff.
- Grillparzer, Franz, *Sämtliche Werke*, Ausgabe der Stadt Wien, ed. by August Sauer, Wien, 1909ff.
- Jüdin von Toledo, I, 7.
- Esther, I, 7.
- Gedichte, I, 10.
- Aufsätze, I, 14.
- Selbstbiographie, I, 16.
- Tagebücher und Literarische Skizzenhefte, II, 7-12.
- Briefe und Dokumente, III, 1-3.
- Grillparzer, Franz, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by August Sauer, III, Stuttgart, 1893.
- Grillparzers Ahnen*, by Rudolf Payer von Thurn, Festgabe zu A. Sauer 60. Geburtstage, Wien, 1915.
- Grillparzer: Gespräche und Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit*, ed. by August Sauer, *Schriften d. Lit. Vereins in Wien*, I, III, VI, XII, XV, XX, Wien, 1904ff.
- Grillparzers Geheimschriften*, ed. by August Sauer, Wien und Leipzig, 1922.

- Gottschall, Rudolf, "Grillparzers Nachlass," *Unsere Zeit*, Neue Folge, 9. Jhrg., 1873, pp. 26ff.
- Gross, Edgar, "Grillparzers Verhältnis zu Shakespeare," *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 51. Jhrg., Berlin, 1915.
- Heine, Heinrich, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Ernst Elster, VII, Leipzig und Wien, 1887-90.
- Heine, Heinrich, *Autobiographie*, ed. by Gustav Karpeles, Berlin, 1888.
- Heine, Heinrich, *Gespräche*, ed. by Hugo Bieber, Berlin, 1926.
- Hermann, Elisabeth, "Histrionics in the Dramas of Franz Grillparzer," *University of California Publications*, Vol. 2.
- Hock, Stephan, "Vormärzliche Pamphlete," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XVII, pp. 128ff.
- Houben, H. H., "Franz Grillparzer und die Zensur," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Bd. 172-173, April-Sept. 1918, pp. 77ff.
- Hradek, L. "Studien zu Grillparzers Altersstil und die Datierung des Estherfragmentes," *Prager Deutsche Studien*, Vol. 24, Prag, 1915.
- Jaffé, Walther, "Alexander Baumann, ein Beitrag zum Wiener lit. Vormärz," *Forschungen z. n. Lit. Gesch.*, Vol. 42, Weimar, 1913.
- Jerusalem, Wilhelm, *Gedanken und Dichter*, Wien und Leipzig, 1905.
- Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, pp. 321ff, New York, London, 1902.
- Jodl, Friedrich, "Grillparzer und die Philosophie," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, VIII, pp. 1ff.
- Karpeles, Gustav, *Jews and Judaism in the 19th Century*, Philadelphia, 1905.
- Karpeles, Gustav, *Heine und seine Zeitgenossen*, Berlin, 1888.
- Kayserling, Meyer, *Die jüdischen Frauen in Geschichte, Literatur und Kunst*, Leipzig, 1879.
- Koch, Max, *Franz Grillparzer, eine Charakteristik*, Frankfurt a.M., 1891.
- Krauss, Rudolph, "Die Quellen der Grillparzerschen Esther," *Internationale Lit. Berichte*, Nr. 10. 9. Jhrg., 15. Mai 1902.
- Krauss, Rudolph, *Esther, Franz Grillparzers Fragment ergänzt*, Stuttgart, 1903.
- Küchler, Walter, "Esther bei Lope de Vega, Racine und Grillparzer," *Jahrbuch für Philologie*, Bd. I, München, 1925.
- Kuh, Emil, *Zwei Dichter Oesterreichs*, Pest, 1872.
- Laipple, Louise, *Grillparzer's Attitude toward Religion*, M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1918.
- Lambert, Elie, "La Juive de Tolède de Grillparzer," *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 2e année, Paris, 1922.
- Lambert, Elie, "Eine Untersuchung der Quellen der *Jüdin von Toledo*," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XIX, pp. 61ff.
- Landa, Meyer J., *The Jew in Drama*, London, 1926.

- Lange, Edmund, *Franz Grillparzer, sein Leben, Dichten und Denken*, Gütersloh, 1894.
- Laube, Heinrich, *Franz Grillparzers Lebensgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1884.
- Laube, Heinrich, *Das Burgtheater*, Leipzig, 1891.
- Lenz, Harold, *Grillparzer's Political Ideas and 'Die Jüdin von Toledo'*, doc. diss. (typewritten MS.), New York University, 1934.
- Lessing, Gotthold E., *Nathan der Weise, Sämtliche Schriften*, III, ed. by Lachmann-Muncker, Stuttgart, 1886-1924.
- Lessing, O. E., *Grillparzer und das Neue Drama*, München-Leipzig, 1905.
- Lessing, O. E., "Schillers Einfluss auf Grillparzer," *University of Wisconsin Bulletin* 54, *Philology and Lit. Series*, II, no. 2, Madison, 1902.
- Lex, Michael, *Die Idee im Drama bei Goethe, Schiller, Grillparzer, Kleist*, München, 1904.
- Lichtenfeld, Adolf, *Grillparzer-Studien*, Wien, 1891.
- Lier, Leonhard, "Grillparzers *Jüdin von Toledo*," *Kunstwart*, 12. Jhrg., 1899.
- Littrow-Bischoff, Auguste, *Aus dem persönlichen Verkehr mit Franz Grillparzer*, Wien, 1873.
- Lublinsky, Samuel, "Grillparzers Esther und Rahel von Toledo," *Monatsschrift für neue Lit. und Kunst*, 2. Jhrg., Heft 9, Juni 10. Juli, 1898.
- Lublinsky, Samuel, "Jüdische Charaktere bei Grillparzer, Hebbel, Ludwig," *Literarische Studien*, Berlin, 1899.
- Mahrenholtz, Richard, *Franz Grillparzer, sein Leben und Schaffen*, Leipzig, 1890.
- Meyer, Sigmund, *Die Wiener Juden, 1700-1900*, 2nd ed., Wien, Berlin, 1918.
- Meyer, Th.A., "Franz Grillparzer und die Ursachen seines langen Verkennens," *Neue Jhrbb. für das Klassische Altertum, Gesch. und deutsche Lit.*, 1903, XI, pp. 419ff.
- Moscheles, *Aus Moscheles' Leben*, nach Briefen und Tagebüchern herausgegeben von seiner Frau, Leipzig, 1872.
- Müller-Guttenbrunn, Adam, *Im Jahrhundert Grillparzers*, Wien, 1893.
- Müller, Joachim, "Grillparzers Menschenauffassung," *Literatur und Leben*, IX, Weimar, 1934.
- Münch, Ilse, "Die Tragik in Drama und Persönlichkeit Franz Grillparzers," *Neue Forschung*, XI, Berlin, 1931.
- Paoli, Betty (B. E. Glück), *Grillparzer und seine Werke*, Stuttgart, 1875.
- Paoli, Betty, "Briefe an Leopold Kompert," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XVIII, pp. 177ff.
- Pichler, Caroline, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben*, ed. by Emil Karl Blümml, München, 1914.

- Pichler, Caroline, "Briefe an L. A. Frankl," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Lit.*, Bd. 154, Neue Serie 54 und 56.
- Pollak, Gustav, *Franz Grillparzer and the Austrian Drama*, New York, 1907.
- Pollhammer, Josef, "Aus den Erinnerungen des Dichters Josef Pollhammer," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XXVIII, pp. 79ff.
- Rau, Hans, *Grillparzer und sein Liebesleben*, Berlin, 1904.
- Reich, Emil, *Franz Grillparzers Dramen*, 3rd ed., Dresden, 1909.
- Roselieb, Hans, "Grillparzers Weltanschauung," *Grillparzer-Studien*, ed. by Oskar Katann, Wien, 1924.
- Rosenberg, Felix, *Der Estherstoff in der germanischen und romanischen Literatur*, Festschrift Adolf Tobler, Braunschweig, 1905.
- Sauer, August, "Bauernfeld und Saphir," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XXVII, pp. 36ff.
- Sauer, August, *Aus dem alten Oesterreich*, Prag, 1895.
- Sauer, August, "Neue Beiträge zum Verständnis und zur Würdigung einiger Gedichte Grillparzers," *Forschungen z. n. Lit. Gesch.*, Festgabe Richard Heinzel, Weimar, 1898.
- Sauer, August, "Emil Wickerhauser und seine Erinnerungen an Grillparzer," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XIV, pp. 268ff.
- Schaefer, Albert, "Grillparzers Verhältnis zur preussisch-deutschen Politik," *Germanische Studien*, Heft 69, Berlin, 1929.
- Scherer, Wilhelm, "Franz Grillparzer," *Vorträge und Aufsätze z. Geschichte d. geistigen Lebens in Oesterreich u. Deutschland*, Berlin, 1874.
- Schreyvogel, Josef, *Tagebücher*, ed. by Carl Glossy, Berlin, 1903.
- Sch(ütz), F. "Grillparzer und die Jüdin von Toledo," *Neue Freie Presse*, 5. Nov. 1896, Nr. 11567.
- Shakespeare, William, *Merchant of Venice*, *Collected Works*, II, pp. 333ff., ed. by William Aldis Wright, London, 1921.
- Sittenberger, Hans, *Grillparzer, sein Leben und Wirken*, Berlin, 1904.
- Stefansky, Georg, *Grillparzers geistige Persönlichkeit*, Festschrift August Sauer, Stuttgart, 1925.
- Stern, Bernhard, *Bauernfeld, ein Dichterporträt*, Leipzig, 1890.
- Strich, Fritz, "Franz Grillparzers Aesthetik," *Forschungen z. n. Lit. Gesch.*, XXIX, München, 1924.
- Tibal, André, "Études sur Grillparzer," *Annales de l'est*, 28e année, fasc. 1, Nancy, Univ. Faculté, Paris-Nancy, 1914.
- Trabert, Adam, *Franz Grillparzer, ein Bild seines Lebens und Dichtens*, Wien, 1890.
- Varnhagen von Ense, K. A., *Tagebücher*, IV, Leipzig, 1862.
- Volkelt, Johannes, "Grillparzer als Dichter des Komischen," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XV, pp. 1ff.

- Volkelt, Johannes, "Grillparzer als Dichter des Willens zum Leben," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, X, pp. 4ff.
- Volkelt, Johannes, "Grillparzer als Dichter des Zwiespalts zwischen Gemüt und Leben," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, IV, pp. 1ff.
- Volkelt, Johannes, *Grillparzer als Dichter des Tragischen*, Nördlingen, Beck, 1888.
- Völker, Karl, "Grillparzers Stellung zur Religion und Kirche," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, 1930, pp. 72ff.
- Waldman, Mark, *Goethe and the Jews*, A Challenge to Hitlerism, New York, London, 1934.
- Wartenegg, Wilhelm von, *Erinnerungen an Franz Grillparzer*, Wien, 1901.
- Wedel-Parlow, Ludolf von, *Grillparzer*, Wertheim a.M., 1932.
- Wedel-Parlow, Ludolf von, "Der junge Grillparzer," *Euphorion*, 30, Heft 4, 1929.
- Weissbart, Gertrud, "Bürgerliches Lebensgefühl in Grillparzers Dramen," *Mnemosyne: Arbeiten z. Erforschung von Sprache und Dichtung*, Heft 3, Bonn, 1929.
- Wertheimer, Josef, *Wiener Jahrbuch*, Wien, 1842ff.
- Williamson, Edward, *Grillparzer's Attitude toward Romanticism*, doc. diss. University of Chicago, 1910.
- Wininger, Salomon, *Grosse Jüdische National-Biographie*, 6 vols., 1925-1932.
- Wolbe, Eugen, *Ludwig August Frankl*, Frankfurt a.M., 1910.
- Wolf-Cirian, Francis, *Grillparzers Frauengestalten*, Stuttgart, Berlin, 1908.
- Wolf, Gerson, Josef Wertheimer, *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Juden in Oesterreich in neuester Zeit*, Wien, 1868.
- Wolf, Gerson, *Geschichte der Juden in Wien*, Wien, 1876.
- Wurzbach, Constantin von, *Franz Grillparzer*, Wien, 1872.
- Wurzbach, Wolfgang von, "Uffo Horn," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XIII, pp. 203ff.
- Wurzbach, W., "Die Jüdin von Toledo in Geschichte und Dichtung," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, IX, pp. 86ff.
- Zausmer, Otto, *Grillparzers Lyrik als Ausdruck seines Wesens*, Wien-Leipzig, 1933.
- Zausmer, Otto, "Beiträge zur politischen Lyrik Grillparzers," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, XXXII, pp. 43ff.
- Zimmermann, Robert, "Aus Gesprächen mit Grillparzer," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, IV, pp. 243ff.
- Yates, Douglas, "Der Kontrast zwischen Kunst und Leben bei Grillparzer," *Germanische Studien*, Heft 75, Berlin, 1929.

VITA

Born July 28, 1905 in Radechau, Austria. Attended Volksschule there; Public Schools 32 and 45 in New York City, Evander Childs High School (1924), Hunter College (B.A. 1928), Columbia University (M.A. 1929), and New York University (Ph.D. 1935). Also took summer courses at University of Berlin and Linguistic Institute. Instructor of German at Brooklyn College.

Date Due

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 07154 0073

55.7
G853Y1

